The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1889.

The Week.

THE particulars of the rerating of Senator Manderson of Nebraska as a military pensioner have a very bad look. Mr. Manderson was wounded in 1864 and granted a half-pension in 1865. From that time to the present his ability to earn a living has been demonstrated by his notable advance in public position, which has brought him in middle life to the very highest council of the nation. All this tells *for* him as a man and *against* him as a pensioner. That is, it has demonstrated in a remarkable way how little Mr. Manderson needs to be supported at the public expense in consequence of wounds received in the military service, or for any other reason. But, as a matter of fact, a fellow named Squires, whom Corporal Tanner took to Washington as a clerk in the Pension Office, and who has since been discharged for gross misbehavior, or rather transferred to a different office (that of timber agent), pulled out of the pigeon-holes of the department the medical certificate on which Manderson's half-pension was granted in 1865, and he (Squires), together with Tanner and one Carpenter, a "medical referee," decided in a private way that Manderson ought to have been awarded a full pension in the beginning—that is, for "total disability," which the law fixes at $30 per month for officers of his rank. This is called rerating. It gave Manderson "back pay" at the rate of $15 per month from the date of his discharge to the present time. It hoisted the sum of $4,000 out of the public treasury into Manderson's pocket, and it causes the additional sum of $15 per month to be paid to him during the remainder of his life if the rerating transaction is allowed to stand.

It is said that Senator Manderson had not applied for a rerating, and that he knew nothing about the proceedings until he received the check for back pay. But it appears that he put it in his pocket just the same. The public will not recognize any difference between the one act and the other. He was either entitled to the money or he was not. Being a lawyer and a Senator as well as a pensioner, he knows what the words "total disability" signify. He knows whether he was totally disabled by a wound received a quarter of a century ago. If he was not, then he knows that he was not entitled to the $4,000 hoisted out of the Treasury for his benefit by Squires, Tanner, and Carpenter, and that he had no moral right to touch it. Whether he had a legal right to it may yet be determined by the courts. A despatch to the Philadelphia *Inquirer* says that if the Secretary of the Interior is not satisfied with the proceeding, he will bring suit against Manderson to recover the money. Such a suit against a Senator will be a public scandal, and one which the people of Nebraska would probably have taken notice of by sending Manderson into retirement if it had occurred before his re-election last winter. The man Squires, who took the initiative in rerating Manderson, was formerly a clerk in the Naval Office of the New York Custom-house. Tanner was in the same office with him. Squires, under the free-and-easy system which aforetime prevailed in the Naval Office, knocked off work for a year or more, but continued to draw his pay. It was found that he was running a pension agency of his own somewhere in the city. He was finally called to order by the Naval Officer and directed to abandon one vocation or the other—either to resign his clerkship or his pension business. After a good deal of difficulty, and after orders had been issued forbidding to pension claimants entrance to Squires's room, he resigned. Naturally he turned up as an invaluable auxiliary to Tanner at Washington. After he was discharged by the Secretary of the Interior for scandalous conduct, he was appointed timber agent at some place in the West, where his opportunities for thrift will probably be as great as they were in either the Pension Office or the Naval Office, and will be worked for all they are worth.

It is believed in Washington that both the President and Secretary Noble are desirous of keeping the Commissioner of Pensions, Mr. Tanner, away from the approaching national gathering of the Grand Army of the Republic. The reason given for this desire is fear of what Tanner may say there on the subject of pensions. It is said the Administration is anxious not to be committed to the service-pension policy, and is afraid that if Tanner attends the meeting and talks, as, of course, he would, he would commit the Administration not only to that, but possibly to some policy even more "liberal to the boys." Fear of Tanner's mouth is not without justification, but it is difficult to see how he can commit the Administration any further than he has already done. He said only a short time ago, in a public speech to some veterans at Chicago: "I tell you frankly that I am for 'the old flag and an appropriation' for every old comrade who needs it. I don't claim that I represent the views of the Administration, but I do know that I have the support of the President and Cabinet in this line—a pension for every old soldier who needs one." If that does not mean a service pension, what does it mean? As for the standard of "need" required to get Tanner's approval, the Manderson case throws sufficient light upon that.

Congressman De Lano, of the Twenty sixth New York District, has been giving a great deal of his time and mental force to the problem of getting the post-offices of his district out of the hands of Democrats and into the hands of Republicans with the least possible delay. When asked how he had succeeded, he is reported to have replied, a day or two ago: "Pretty well. There are 190 fourth-class post-offices in my district, and 140 of them are now run by Republicans. The others pay so little that there is no demand for a change. I am pretty well satisfied with the Administration." Probably this case represents accurately the average speed with which the post-office guillotine has been worked by the First-Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Clarkson, since he took office under the pious Mr. Wanamaker, or, as he is called by his religious admirers, "our beloved John." Nothing approaching Mr. Clarkson's record has ever been made in the Department. During the same period of time in which his predecessor, Mr. Vilas, removed 4,000 fourth-class postmasters, Mr. Clarkson has removed 13,000. His best record was 1,015 in one week, or an average of 169 each day for six days; for, of course, no assistant of so good a man as Mr. Wanamaker would be allowed to work on Sunday. This would be about one removal every three minutes, which is extremely rapid work, and which would not be possible under a system that allowed removals for cause only. The present rate is about 600 a week, and this is likely to be the regular pace, kept up with slight variations, until every one of the 55,000 fourth-class post-offices in the land has a good Republican in it.

An interesting glimpse at Republican methods in a Southern State is afforded by the proceedings of a meeting of Republicans recently held in Eureka Springs, Ark., to protest against the appointment, at the instance of Powell Clayton, of J. W. True as Postmaster. The resolutions, while holding President Harrison blameless, on the ground that he was "misled and deceived in the premises," accuse Clayton of disregarding the wishes of nine-tenths of the Republicans in the place in this matter, and declare that he "has openly and notoriously violated repeatedly the will of the Republican party, not only in his own home, but in different parts of the State of Arkansas, *and has prostituted his high privilege in our party as the dispenser of Federal patronage.*" The resolutions further declare that "it is our honest conviction that Gen. Clayton's leadership of his party in this State is only for his own personal benefit in controlling Federal patronage, and not for the success of Republican principles and the party," and that he "has thereby ruined Republican success in this State; and it is our opinion that so long as these methods in procuring this and other appointments are resorted to and he remains at the head of our party, we despair of success." The participants in the meeting resolved that they would not further submit to "this damaging and ruinous element in our party," and called on "all true and tried Republicans throughout the State" to follow their example, and "assist in every lawful way and manner to restore our party to honorable and impartial leadership." Northern Republicans who

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot understand why their party does not stand better with decent men at the South, may study these proceedings with profit.

The prospectus of the North American Salt Company is too much for the loyalty of the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, which is moved to say:

"The combination between American and British salt magnates is designed to go into operation on January 1, 1890. Congress will meet a month—perhaps two or three months—before that date, and will give its undivided attention for a few weeks to the subject of 'combines.' *Salt must be put on the free list.*"

What is to become of our precious platform adopted at Chicago last year, which says that "if there shall remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of the internal-revenue taxes, rather than the surrender of *any part* of our protective system"? Is not salt a part of our protective system? Anybody who has kept the run of tariff debates for a quarter of a century will be apt to think so. Anybody who recalls the wonderful speeches of the Republican members of Congress last summer, when the salt paragraph in the Mills bill was under discussion, will think that this article is as large a part of the underpinning of the protective system as anything else that can be named. Who has authorized the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* to trample on the precious platform and knock out the underpinning of the tariff in this reckless fashion? What authority has this wild Western newspaper to pledge Congress to so ruthless an act? What has the question of Trusts to do with the tariff anyway? Did not Mr. Blaine tell us that Trusts were largely private affairs? And how, we ask, are the beneficent effects of the duty on salt (79 per cent.) lessened by the salt combine? The theory of protection is that the money made by the protected interests is "kept in the country," and that it is diffused in the form of dew all over the land. Obviously in such a case it can make no difference whether the money is collected by a Trust or by individuals. The formation and distribution of dew will go on just the same in either case. We think that the *Globe-Democrat* is much too hasty.

The collapse of the Salt Trust is due entirely to the force of public opinion. There are plenty of capitalists who would have been glad to share in the venture. The prospectus of the Syndicate was very attractive. The plan announced was feasible, and would probably have been subscribed for two or three times over if confidence in Trusts had not been so much impaired by the hostility of the press, the State Legislatures, the courts, and all the recognized organs of public sentiment. One of the most ominous signs of all, and the most painful to the protected Trusts, has been the vacillating course of the *Tribune*, which seems one day to be coming over to the free-traders and the next to be going back to the high-tariffites. On Monday morning it essayed both rôles in the same paragraph, thus:

"Free-trade Democrats have the idea that Trusts and other similar combinations are fostered by the tariff. If they could realize how the sugar monopolists feel about the matter, and the promoters of the Salt Trust, they might change their minds. The power of the people to smash any combination, by reducing or abolishing a duty on imports, is one which monopolists are just now inclined to regard with great respect."

The difficulty of making out which way the *Tribune* is steering has probably unsettled the minds of many American investors, and may have affected unfavorably the subscription to the salt combine in England. The announcement from the other side that if the owners of the salt works show a good disposition, the scheme may be taken up in England next October, is very funny indeed, considering that the prospectus did not contemplate that the owners of salt works should do anything except sell out for cash. Yet it is true, we believe, that the only heavy subscriptions made were those of producers of salt whose property was to be embraced in the combine.

If there is any kind of property in this country that British syndicates do not want to buy, after taking the breweries at the owners' estimate of their value, we cannot imagine what it may be. Of all vocations by which men make a living, brewing in a large city is the one requiring the closest personal attention and the most unceasing vigilance. A document published by the Church Temperance Society a year or two ago disclosed the fact that most of the beer-saloons in this city are held under chattel mortgage by the brewers. It was shown that one brewer owned nearly two hundred saloons, the street and number of each one and the nominal proprietor being designated. Of course the strictest attention is needed to secure the proper returns from each saloon. Now, fancy all the breweries consolidated and the management of these and their outlying dependencies, the saloons, put under a single management, and that management responsible to a board of some kind sitting in London. What would probably be the end of such a speculation? We have heard of cheating in Western mines owned by foreigners, when there was only one thing and not more than half-a-dozen persons to be watched. Who will watch the breweries and saloon-keepers in a dozen American cities and render faithful accounts weekly or monthly to a confiding syndicate in Lombard Street?

The *Tribune* has an article entitled "Wool and Ballots," the aim of which is to show how much the price of wool has been advanced by Harrison's election, and how great an advantage that is for the country. In the concluding paragraph, however, it appears to recall the trifling circumstance that there are buyers as well as sellers of wool. It admits that the manufacturers "have not yet realized corresponding benefits," and that "it is felt by most of them that the state of the market for goods does not warrant so large an advance as has been realized in wool." What ought we to do in such a case? The *Tribune* has its own idea about it, and we have never seen anything more lucid in its discussions of public questions. The wool-growers ought to lower their prices for wool *a little*. Here is the remedy in its own words:

"If the growers have insisted upon too rapid or large an advance, some modification of prices may be found necessary in order to secure ready sale of goods representing the entire supply of wool. If, on the other hand, the goods market will support the manufacture fairly on the basis of wool at present prices, the most enterprising and skilful will soon discover and demonstrate the fact, and others will be encouraged to follow their example."

It is so much the custom of the producers of staple articles to accept less than the market rate in order to accommodate the purchasers that, we have no doubt, Mr. Columbus Delano, President of the Wool-Growers' Association, will speedily call his clan together and address them in words like these: "We have been too hasty and too greedy. We have '*insisted* upon too rapid and large an advance.' The manufacturers cannot stand it. We have demanded twenty-six cents a pound for our wool. The manufacturers will pay us this price rather than not have it. But as some modification may be found necessary in order to secure a *ready sale* of woollen goods, I move that we charge only twenty-three cents per pound. The voting will be by ballot."

We can imagine that the assembled wool-growers would receive the proposition at first with the respectful silence due to the known wisdom of the *Tribune* in commercial matters. But after some moments spent in pulling the wool away from their own eyes, probably somebody would ask how they could be sure that all would join in charging lower prices for wool, because, even if a pledge should be signed to that effect, some one might sneak off and sell his clip at the full market rate. Such an inquiry, once started, would spread to growers not members of the Association, to foreign growers, to wool-merchants having stocks on hand, and to foreign merchants in like case. How to get them to join in charging lower prices in order to make things easier for the manufacturers would be an ever-widening puzzle. Probably before all could be brought in and induced to sign the pledge, and to give satisfactory bonds for keeping it, the whole clip would have been worked off, and nothing done. There is, however, a latent idea in the *Tribune's* suggestion. It is that the wool-growers and manufacturers are partners in business, and that the former cannot be permanently prosperous if the latter are impoverished. The manufacturers will not work much longer on the starvation wages they have been getting. They are already on strike for lower duties on wool. They are demanding ad-valorem instead of specific rates, and of course they would not want that change unless it promised to give them wool on easier terms. Now we advise the wool-growers, instead of lowering the prices of their own wool by ballot, in the way hinted at by the *Tribune*, to lower the price of South American, Australian, Cape, and Donskoi wool by consenting to a change in the tariff. It is immaterial what you call it, so that the manufacturer gets his wool with less difficulty.

The organ of the American Protective Tariff League is moved to wrath by the charge that

LIBNET.CO.NZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it seeks to "*unduly* advance the prices of articles entering into the daily consumption of the people." It finds this charge in the columns of the New York *Tribune*, reference being had particularly to the article of refined sugar as at present monopolized by a Trust, and it brands the charge as "false," although it prefers to consider it due to a misunderstanding on the part of the *Tribune*. The *Tribune* has a good many misunderstandings, but this is not one of them. It was easy to say last year, while party feeling was in an excited state, that the tariff had nothing to do with Trusts, because people did not then stop to discriminate. They can see now that the tariff has to do with some Trusts, and not with others—that it is the bulwark and support of the Sugar Trust, the Lead Trust, the cotton-bagging, the binding-twine, castor-oil, linseed oil, and twenty or thirty others, while it has nothing to do with the Standard Oil, the Cotton Oil, or the Distillers' Trusts. Hence we are convinced that the *Tribune* is not laboring under the misunderstanding which the *American Economist* kindly intimates.

The tariff organ insists that it does not seek *unduly* to advance the prices of articles entering into daily consumption of the people. Evidently much depends upon the meaning of this phrase, and especially upon the kind of people who have the power to make the definition. Elsewhere in the same number of the tariff organ we find a triumphant comparison of the railway freight charges in this country and in Europe, the average here being $1.04 per ton, while it is $1.70 in Germany, $2.00 in England, and $2.14 in France. Now, what is it that has made the rate lower in this country than in the others named? Can we fancy that, if all the railways in the United States had been tied up in a Trust, the rate for freight would ever have gone as low as it is to-day? In such a case the railway managers would have said that they had no desire to maintain *unduly* high rates, but inasmuch as they were relieved from the pressure of competition, and were under no compulsory process to find the most economical methods of operation, they would be the exclusive judges of high rates, and would maintain them at about the figures prevailing twenty years ago. Competition has not allowed them to do so. That is the alpha and omega of railway rates in this country. Unduly high rates are any rates higher than free competition will fix and establish. When any man talks about his intention not to unduly advance the price of an article which everybody must buy and which he alone can sell, he means that he intends to fix those prices to suit himself, and that anybody who does not like them can let them alone.

Valuable testimony to the efficacy of the new ballot law in Massachusetts, which is to go into effect this fall, is furnished by J. E. Fitzgerald, one of the shrewdest and most adroit of the Democratic politicians of Boston. In speaking before a Democratic meeting on Thursday last, he urged the great necessity of harmony in the party because of the lessened chances of Democratic success caused by the new voting regulations. "There is," he said in describing the new law, "no ballot-distribution, nobody can hustle anybody up to the polls, and every man votes according to his conscience, behind a desk, with nobody to see him." The keen eye of the "practical politician" has detected one of the greatest reforms which the new law will secure: "Nobody can hustle anybody up to the polls." Nobody can "fix" a ticket for the bribed or intimidated voter, put it in his hand, and "hustle him up to the polls;" and watch him while he casts it. There might be some prospect of "fixing" his ballot under the new system did not the law forbid any except official ballots to be used. That is the last and most deadly blow to the "hustler's" business, and that is why the politicians everywhere fight that provision the most earnestly of all.

The synopsis of decisions by the Treasury between July 6 and 20 is edifying for taxpayers. One of them is this:

"*Wooden cases* for use by manufacturers and venders of bottled soda-water, beer, and other liquors, and which are left by them with consumers to be called for again for the purpose of refilling, are not the *usual and necessary* coverings for imported bottles, and, when imported containing bottles, are dutiable at 100 per cent. ad valorem, under the proviso of section 7 of the Act of March 3, 1883." (Letter to Collector of Customs at New York, July 11, 1889.)

A hundred per cent. on a plain wooden box is rather a severe tax. How can the Collector know on entry that the box is to be thus left with the consumer or buyer of the contents, and called for and refilled, and is not to be used as kindling-wood? Are bottles treated in the same way? Is the box free of tax if not to be thus called for? What is the "usual and necessary covering" of imported bottles, if not a wooden box?

Mr. Wanamaker's idea of selling our present Post-office building and moving the office up town has been disposed of very summarily. Scarcely a voice has been heard in favor of the proposition, while practically the entire business community has condemned it as little less than foolishness. If Mr. Wanamaker had thought about it a little in advance, he would have seen that so long as the exchanges, banks, steamship and railway companies, heavy business and commercial houses, as well as newspaper offices—in fact, all the largest contributors to the mail service—are down town, they will insist upon having the Post-office as near to them as possible. The suggestion of removal up town must have come from the same source as the one to have the elevated railways extended to connect with the Post-office. The office is at present within a few steps of the stations of two elevated roads, and a switch track, if it were practicable, would not save an appreciable amount of time.

There is no doubt that, so far as Judge Settle of North Carolina is concerned, the "good old days of Grant" have indeed returned. The Judge, who served as captain in the Confederate army, was one of Grant's favorites, and between 1871 and 1877 he was able to get almost anything he desired from the national Administration. President Grant gave him the mission to Peru in 1871, and in 1877 appointed him United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida. The Judge was naturally a devoted Grant man, and, if we are not mistaken, was an ardent advocate of a third term. Yet even in the heyday of his friendship with Gen. Grant he did not get so many "good things" for himself and family as the *Times* shows that he has been able to get from Gen. Harrison. The list reads as follows:

"Thomas Settle, son of Judge Settle, solicitor; Tyro Glenn, brother-in-law of Judge Settle, United States Marshal; Douglas Settle, son of Judge Settle, cadet at West Point; B. C. Sharpe, son-in-law of Judge Settle, General Storekeeper; Oliver H. Docker, brother-in-law of Judge Settle, Consul-General at Rio de Janeiro; Mrs. Hellen, sister-in-law of Judge Settle, stamp clerk at Winston. The total salaries to be drawn from the public purse for the benefit of this single family foot up to the very comfortable figure of $27,000 a year."

We doubt if the seven Harrison relatives for whom the President has found places draw more than that aggregate from the national Treasury. There is no equal to the Settle list that we have heard of save another for North Carolina which the *Times* mentions but does not give in detail, that of the family of J. J. Mott. Mott is himself Revenue Collector, and has succeeded in getting offices for five members of his family. It is small wonder that there is discontent in North Carolina at the greediness of the Harrison-Settle-Mott Trust.

Gen. Boulanger has made a sudden descent from the sublime to the ridiculous. He had announced himself as a candidate for the General Council in 451 cantons, and has been successful in two dozen. He had been debarred from standing for the Chamber of Deputies in more than one electoral district by the new law which restricts multiple candidatures. So he turned to the *conseils généraux*, which are administrative bodies something like our county boards of supervisors, but having much larger political powers. They assist in electing Senators, and they are charged in a comprehensive way to see that the republic receives no detriment. In the event of a dissolution of Parliament by a *coup d'état* the *conseils généraux* are empowered by law to form a new Parliament forthwith. Probably this feature of the political constitution of France prompted Boulanger to raid that body with horse, foot, and dragoons all at once. That he had every confidence of success was shown by cable despatches on Saturday, embracing an interview with Boulanger himself, in which he candidly set forth his electoral expectations, and announced the intention of maintaining peace with England and settling the affairs of Egypt in a satisfactory way. His adventure among the *conseils généraux* turns out to have been a complete fiasco. The plébiscite has been taken, and it is against him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GEORGIA REJECTS THE BLAIR BILL.

THE action of the Georgia Legislature last week, in rejecting a proposition to endorse the Blair bill, must be received with great satisfaction by President Harrison, because it calls the attention of the whole country to the emphatic manner in which this representative Southern State has vindicated the position which he took, five years ago, when this question was before the Senate. In a speech delivered on the 25th of March, 1884, Gen. Harrison thus concisely and forcibly presented the argument against attempting to foster education in the Southern States by throwing millions of dollars out of the national Treasury into those States:

"The only permanent reliance for the education of the masses must be upon local taxation in the States; every one concedes that. One dollar voted by the people of any school district for the support of common schools is worth $10 given out of the Treasury of the United States. It evinces an interest in education, and guarantees a careful and intelligent supervision. Only a local supervision and interest will bring these constituencies that are now so backward in the race of education abreast with other States. In my judgment there could be no worse policy than to throw in a single year into those States $15,000,000 out of the national Treasury."

Five years ago it was open to anybody to say that such views as these of Gen. Harrison's were only a matter of theory; but the test of experience in Georgia has in the meantime vindicated them by facts. The vindication is so striking, and the moral is of such universal application throughout the South, that it is well worth while to set forth these facts at length.

Georgia has long been known as "the Empire State of the South," but for years it lagged behind its poorer neighbor Florida in the matter of public education. So long ago as November, 1882, Mr. Gustavus J. Orr, then State School Commissioner, in his report to the Legislature, condemned "the utter inadequacy of the sums which we are applying to the support of schools to the object to be accomplished"; pointed out "the urgent necessity of more liberal appropriations for schools"; showed that a tax of only one-fifth of one per cent. upon the property of the State would keep the schools in operation six months, nearly twice the period that they were then open; met the former plea of poverty by the declaration that "the time has come when we can do better"; and concluded: "I am sure that we have reached a point where we can continue our schools in operation for six months [nearly twice the period at that time] without unduly burdening the people."

The Legislature, however, failed to act upon Mr. Orr's recommendation. The reason for this failure was stated in an interesting letter to the *Evening Post* by Mr. Woodrow Wilson, author of the work on 'Congressional Government,' and himself a native of the South, who wrote as follows:

"In the winter of 1882-83 I spent some time in Atlanta, Ga., while the Legislature was in session. The project of Federal aid to education was already then being pushed. One day I dropped into the gallery of the State Senate Chamber for an hour, and chanced to find a discussion in progress upon a proposal to increase the appropriation for education, as Mr. Orr had urged that the State was so abundantly able to do. Only a small minority favored the measure for heavier taxation. The majority supported a counter-resolution that the Senators and Representatives of the State in Congress be requested to do all in their power to secure the passage of a law giving aid from the Federal Treasury to education in the States. I heard one speech made in opposition to this begging resolution. It was a sturdy appeal to the self-respect and independence of Georgians, in view of what the speaker treated as the unquestioned ability of the State to support a school system worthy of so great and prosperous a commonwealth. No attempt was made by the majority to answer his argument, which, like Mr. Orr's plea, was indeed unanswerable. The majority kept silence, and contented themselves with passing the resolution appealing for outside help to do what by their very silence they confessed they were able to do themselves. It was evident that no increase in the State appropriation for public education would be voted so long as there was the least prospect of aid from Washington. The whole performance impressed me as a shameless declaration, upon the part of a well-to-do community, of its deliberate determination to enjoy the easy position of a beneficiary of the national Government to the fullest possible extent, rather than to be independent and support a good school system by its own unaided efforts."

Mr. Wilson's judgment that "no increase in the State appropriation for public education would be voted so long as there was the least prospect of aid from Washington" proved correct. Year after year passed without any increase of school taxation in Georgia, the people meanwhile waiting in the hope of getting the needed money from the Federal Treasury. But by last winter they had generally concluded that the public sentiment of the country would never permit the passage of the Blair bill, and they resolved to rely only upon "local supervision and interest." The Legislature therefore passed a bill making a large increase in the amount appropriated for public schools. This marked the turning-point in the long controversy as to whether the people of Georgia should build up a good school system themselves, or play the rôle of beggars, and the rejection last week by the Legislature of a resolution endorsing the "Bill to Promote Mendicancy" followed as a matter of course. Ever since the fight over heavier taxation for schools was won in the Legislature last winter, public interest in education throughout the State has grown steadily and rapidly, and there is no longer any doubt that the commonwealth will soon have a common-school system which will put it "abreast with other States."

This would be a matter of national interest if it concerned Georgia alone; but Georgia is in this respect only a type of all the Southern States. Gen. Harrison's words applied to them all when he said that "the only permanent reliance for the education of the masses must be upon local taxation in the States," and that "only a local supervision and interest will bring these constituencies abreast with other States." The worst feature of the long agitation of the Blair bill has been the check which it put upon the normal development of this local interest. Some scattering talk of throwing millions of dollars out of the national Treasury into those States is still heard, but the advocates of this demoralizing policy grow fewer and weaker all the while.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL AND THE TELEGRAPH.

IT appears that Postmaster-General Wanamaker heard from somebody that the Western Union Telegraph Company sent messages for certain large corporations at the rate of one mill per word, and, without making further investigation, he immediately fixed that rate for all Government business passing over the wires. It turns out that Mr. Wanamaker was entirely mistaken in his premises; that no messages are sent for any corporations at any such rate; that that rate is far below the cost of the business to the company, and even below the cost of *delivering* the messages after they are transmitted, transcribed, registered, enveloped, and superscribed. In short, Mr. Wanamaker has made a blunder, and the question now is whether he has the manliness to acknowledge and correct it, or whether he is one of those narrow-minded persons who esteem it a point of honor to stick to a decision once made, no matter how unjust it may be. A statesman like Mr. Gladstone can back out of a war, even under the stigma of a lost battle, when it becomes clear that the war ought not to have been begun. A weaker man would insist upon beating the enemy in order to teach him not to insist upon his rights in the future.

Now, Mr. Wanamaker must do one of two things. He must either convince fair-minded men that it is just and proper to cut down the price of Government telegraphing to one mill per word, or he must rescind the order he has made. If he does not do one of these things, not even his Sunday-school will save him from condemnation in the minds of business men, with whom he likes to stand well. Already we find among his supporters in the press a disposition to turn the matter off with a blast against great corporations, as though it were right and creditable for the Government to take from the Western Union Telegraph Company by force what it would not take from an individual. Such demagogue appeals might answer for some people, but not for Mr. Wanamaker. He belongs to the class of rich men himself. His faith in corporations has never been shaken, but their faith in him will be shaken mightily if he or his immediate supporters are found parroting the slang of Gen. Butler when he wants to excite the prejudices of labor against capital. Mr. Wanamaker has no standing except in the ranks of capital. His figure rallying the horny-handed sons of toil against corporate greed would be a laughing-stock for the continent. We therefore advise the Pottsville *Miner's Journal*, for example, not to emulate the New York *World* in this species of argument. The *World's* antipathy to capital is known to be unconquerable and deep-seated. When it declaims against rich men and corporations, we recognize the real shriek of the proletariat. No such purity and singleness of purpose would be allowed to the *Miner's Journal*, still less to Mr. Wanamaker himself.

We conclude, therefore, that Mr. Wanamaker must set about his defence in a reasonable way, and that he must not be too slow about it. He says that he has learned that the Western Union Company serves certain corporations at one mill per word. Dr. Green, the President of the company, replies that Mr. Wanamaker is entirely mistaken.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He says that this rate is much below actual cost, and that the company does not send messages for less money than it has to pay to its messenger boys. If Mr. Wanamaker has doubts on this point, the onus is nevertheless upon him to prove his thesis. Ample facilities will, no doubt, be given him for this purpose, whenever he shall show an inclination to begin. We will presume that up to this time he has been simply mistaken, having "gone off at half cock," as novices in public affairs are apt to do. This excuse, since Dr. Green's statement was made, is no longer available. Therefore it may be expected that he will speedily make good his own statement, or withdraw it.

We quite agree with those who say that the Government is entitled to as low rates as anybody for similar service. It is entitled to no less, but it is entitled to no more. It is able to pay, and it ought to pay, a fair rate. The presumption is that a fair rate is that which others pay voluntarily, but this presumption may be rebutted. The mere fact that a law of Congress authorizes the Postmaster-General to fix the rate does not help one to decide what is fair and just. It is a matter of business, of *quantum meruit*, and it is quite proper to take into consideration the special, not the general, services, if any, that the Government renders to the company—the general services being paid for by taxation, to which the owners of the property contribute. Dr. Green denies that the company has ever taken a stone or a stick of timber from the Government land. Certainly, the Government has not carried the poles, wires, linemen, and operators free of charge, nor has it put up the wires when they were blown down, or supplied new ones when the old ones were worn out. Has the Government furnished the right of way? Certainly it has not done so at any cost to itself. The right of way through the States belongs to the States and municipalities to give or withhold, and the latter are now requiring, very properly, that telegraph wires be put under ground. Right of way through the Territories is too trifling a matter to have been in Mr. Wanamaker's thoughts when he descanted on the services rendered by the Government to the company.

"Similar service" means service performed in similar time and manner, and at like cost to the party rendering it. If the Government gets its messages by "drop copy," like the Associated Press, no delivery by messenger being required, it is entitled to as good rates as the Associated Press, which, by the way, are far above one mill per word, and probably higher on the average than the Government has been accustomed to pay and was paying before Mr. Wanamaker made his recent order. If the Government builds lines for the company, or keeps them in repair when built, or pays the wages of operators in whole or in part, or carries materials free, then it is entitled to the same rates as the railroads which thus share in the first cost of the service. If it does none of these things, but on the contrary gets a preference in time on all business transmitted, and has a large reporting service free of charge, which no other patron has, then it is not entitled to any advantage in rates over private persons and corporations.

TELEGRAPH CHARGES IN AMERICA AND GERMANY.

In the July number of the *North American Review* Prof. Ely writes in advocacy of a Government telegraph. Most of the article consists of statements of opinion—the opinion, for instance, that a government is likely to be less corrupt if it does more business, or that the abuses which result from having a matter partly in politics will be lessened if we get it wholly in politics. As long as these remain mere statements of opinion it is impossible to refute them. But it is the misfortune of the advocates of State socialism not to be able to content themselves with expressions of opinion, but occasionally to descend to facts; and when they come to facts they almost always state them wrongly.

The article before us contains quite a marked instance of this kind. It ends with a comparison of telegraph charges in the United States and in other countries. It says that we may assume that the average charge in the United States is fifty cents a message of ten words, while that of Germany is only seventeen cents for ten words, and from this a deduction of one and a quarter cents per word is allowed if the message contains less than ten words. When a thing of that kind is stated by a man whose position should make him a responsible authority, people will believe him. It is worth while to examine the matter in detail and show how untrue the statement really is.

What Prof. Ely means by saying "we may assume" that the average charge in the United States is 50 cents a ten-word message we do not know. If he means that the advocates of State socialism are liable to make assumptions without regard to facts, perhaps he is right. If he means that this is a proper way of proceeding, he is decidedly wrong. What the average charge for a ten word message in the United States is, we have no means of telling; but the average charge for all messages, counting the longest as well as the shortest, during the last year covered by the Western Union report was 24 per cent. less than the figures assumed by Prof. Ely. The total number of messages sent was 51,464,000; the aggregate receipts were $19,711,000. The average receipt per message of every kind, including the longest as well as the shortest, was thus 38 cents instead of 50. If we omit miscellaneous receipts, the actual tolls per message are said to be only 31 cents.

If now we compare the German figures of the same kind, we find that in the year 1885 the number of telegrams sent* in the German Empire was 14,025,820, the receipts 19,883,240 marks, making an average charge of 33 cents per telegram, or very slightly lower than that in the United States. In this connection it must also be remembered that the proportion of very long despatches is far greater in the United States than in Germany, so that there is every reason to believe that the charge per space unit was much cheaper here than there. Let it be further remembered that the density of population in Europe is so much greater than in the United States that a 33-cent charge in Europe represents worse economy than the 38-cent—not to say a 31-cent—charge in the United States. This is not wholly or chiefly a question of distance as affecting the telegraph economy, although distance has considerably more influence than Prof. Ely will allow in his argument. It is also due to the fact that with a large population per square mile telegraph service can be and ought to be so much better organized as to do a vastly greater amount of work with little additional expense.

Let us now look at the matter in another aspect, and not compare average receipts, but tariffs of charges. We find from the German telegraph rate-sheet of 1888 (we have not been able to obtain a copy of the present year, but have no reason to suppose that any considerable change has been made) the following results:

For telegrams in Germany (address and signature included in every case)	1½ cents a word
For Austria	2½ do
For France	3½ do
For Italy	5 do
For Spain and Russia	6 do

It is further to be noted that a minimum price of about 14 cents is placed on all telegrams. If we now allow for the address and signature, we find that the ten-word telegram becomes the fifteen or twenty-word telegram, and that that should be the unit of comparison with the United States. Under these circumstances, we find that the fifteen-word message rate within Germany is 22 cents, to Austria or Denmark it is 37 cents, to France 52 cents, to Italy 75 cents, and to Spain or Russia 90 cents. Prof. Ely may decry distance as a factor for telegraph rates as much as he pleases, but European telegraph rates are graded according to distance, even if (though nominally) controlled by international boundaries and questions of transit. To be sure, a 22-cent rate prevails, where we have here 25 and 30-cent rates; but the 37-cent rate operates on an average at shorter distances than our 40-cent rate, the 75-cent rate at shorter distances than our 60-cent rate, and the 90-cent rate at shorter distances than our 75-cent rate.

Still another point deserves most serious notice. Not merely are the rates substantially equal to-day, but the German rate has been rising while the American has been decidedly falling. We give comparative figures for the latest dates of April compared with those of ten years earlier:

	1876.	1885.
Germany:		
Messages	8,768,535	14,025,820
Receipts, R.M.	12,175,319	19,883,240
Receipts per Message, R.M.	1.39	1.42
United States:		
Messages	18,729,567	42,096,583
Receipts, $	10,034,986	17,706,834
Receipts per message, cts.	54	41

*We have before us no figures for a later date which separate telegraphic from postal receipts. For obvious reasons it is better to count the number of despatches sent rather than the whole number handled, which is often given in statistics. The figures do not include Bavaria and Wirtemberg, which have separate telegraph services.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To be sure, United States rates have fluctuated somewhat from year to year, and would be objected to by the State Socialist as unsteady, but for ourselves we prefer an unsteady improvement to a steady deterioration.

This article is not intended as a defence of the Western Union Telegraph Company. While we do not agree with all the attacks that have been made upon that company, we think that it might have done better by the public, and has made great mistakes of policy which it ought to have avoided. We simply wish to show that when matters are truthfully presented, Government management at its best can barely show as good results as corporation management at its worst, and that if proper allowance is made for difference of density of population, the boasted economy of Germany proves to be no economy at all.

CLERICAL CONSCIENCES.

THREE or four rather striking proofs of the growing despite put upon theological tests by those who submit to them formally have recently fallen under our notice. Prof. Briggs of this city, who has long been noted for his alarming habit of speaking out in meeting, in an article on the question of Presbyterian creed-revision in the *Presbyterian Review* for July, coolly alludes to the lost sense of obligation in subscribing to the Westminster Confession in terms which would be sure to be highly resented if an outsider were to use them. He says: "If the Presbyterian Church is to revise the standards to suit all these claimants who are at present in the ranks of her ministry, it is clear that more than half of our venerable documents will be revised away." Speaking of the difficulty which many young men feel in subscribing, he says of those already in the ministry: "They manage in some way to soothe their troubled consciences, or to toughen them by lax interpretation of the standards or the terms of subscription."

The question of theological tests has recently had a new airing in England, in connection with the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to abolish such tests in the Scottish universities, or rather in the "secular" chairs of those institutions, leaving it to a special committee to devise a form of test for the theological professors. The London *Spectator*, which paper has long been set for the defence of the faith, approves the change, on the ground that it will tend to diminish conscienceless subscription, saying, "We all know how willingly in our English universities men accept tests in a non-natural sense, and how much mischief that taking of false pledges—for false it is so to take them—has done." With this may properly be mentioned Prof. Sanday's article in the July *Contemporary* on the prospects of theology in England. He ostensibly is replying to Mrs. Humphry Ward's late description of the decadent and little original character of theological teaching and investigation in England, but he has to admit that a large part of what she said was true. He says that the leaders of English theological thought have no idea where they are coming out; they follow the Germans most reluctantly, yet perforce they must follow; and, in fact, their attitude, as he describes it, is like that of the Bishop in the story, who said to his clergy, speaking of the three-witnesses verse in the Epistle of John, "This text is probably spurious, but it must not be given up without a struggle." Prof. Sanday thinks that the British laity are willing patiently to wait until their accredited teachers find out what to believe, and hence that any dream of a "New Reformation" is wholly futile.

Such testimonies as these are significant as being the utterances of those who speak from the inside, and are worth dwelling upon because they show that the sense of obligation which has been so eaten into in the commercial and political world has not failed to undergo great deterioration even in those who still are unquestionably the most conscientious class in society—the clergy. They could not escape, in fact, when the infection is so widespread. The Church and the ministry are more peculiarly susceptible than ever before to social influences, and if society has come to look leniently upon trustees who are not trustworthy, directors who do not direct, and methods of business which cannot stand up before a sensitive conscience, it was inevitable that the fine sense of honor which has characterized those who stand in the most sacred of places should have suffered somewhat. The ministry is compelled, or feels itself compelled, to wink at so many questionable transactions of church members that it naturally comes at last to wink at its own intellectual dishonesty. President Harrison, standing up at Woodstock to laud the use of wealth made by a man whose gains were in a large part discreditable, fell, all unconsciously no doubt, into the unfortunate attitude which the representatives of the Church too often adopt in like circumstances, and it is an attitude which carries its own demoralization with it.

We know how rarely a question of theological tests presents itself to a man as a pure question of honor or infamy. When it comes in that fashion, we do not believe that there is a minister in the land who would not settle it in the right way. But it is usually enmeshed in casuistry. The issue seldom appears clear and simple, especially after the theological obligation has been assumed. In the case of students for the ministry the case is easier, and we have Prof. Briggs's word for it that they, in increasing numbers, are shrinking from the bonds they are expected to put on. The result is, the Professor says, "the Presbyterian Church has not been able for some years to supply a sufficient number of ministers to fill our ranks." And he adds, what was of course to be expected, "There is a feeling in some quarters that the average quality and standing of the ministry have already been lowered, and that the average is likely to become lower still."

The only way to abolish the dangers inherent in theological tests is to abolish the tests themselves, so far as possible. This is practically the policy advocated by Prof. Briggs. Let us leave the creed alone, he says, "as at once the measure of our orthodoxy and the measure of our departure from it," and make the terms of subscription as broad in ecclesiastical law as they now are in fact—so broad that a minister of any Christian denomination could honorably take them. It would be a good thing if there were any chance of this being done; but there is not. Revision will drag along for some years, resulting, possibly, at the end in some minor changes of phraseology, and that will leave the whole question really at the same place where it is now, while it will have had the bad effect of lulling troubled consciences, in the meanwhile, and getting more men into a position which they will feel to be false for them, and yet from which they will not know how to escape.

THE PARNELL COMMISSION.

LONDON, July 12, 1889.

THE Parnell Commission has now passed its hundredth day of sitting. Nearly 100 witnesses have been examined, and over 90,000 questions have been asked. The taking of testimony is expected to close during the coming week. The counsel on both sides will reserve their summing up until after the long vacation, that is, until October, and the judges will make their report about the time Parliament meets, that is, in February or March, 1890. I have seen no one in London, of either political party, who does not look on the whole proceeding as a terrible mistake. The Gladstonians treat it with ridicule, and the Conservatives talk of it as a blunder into which they were led by the cocksureness of the *Times*. "We," that is, Messrs. Walter, Macdonald, and Soames, were so sure of their game that they persuaded all their friends that they were going to settle the Irish question by completely discrediting the Irish members, and of course no greater boon could be bestowed on the Conservative party than such a settlement effected in such a way.

The object of the inquiry was to see whether the Irish members were directly connected with outrages—that is, whether certain persons named had a hand or part in setting on foot certain determinate attacks on person or property. But the act was so worded that the judges have felt bound to admit evidence showing the indirect connection of Irish members with crime—that is, showing that outrages had occurred in certain places after these members had made certain speeches in them; or that outrages had followed the establishment of branches of the Land League, of which League they were prominent or active managers; or that they had circulated newspapers containing instigation to crime; or that they had associated in a friendly way with persons subsequently discovered to be the perpetrators of criminal offences. Consequently, the inquiry before the judges has taken on the nature and proportions of an examination of a certain period of Irish history, including the conduct and motives of the principal actors in it; and the work of the judges has become in some sort that of historians. The opinions of all sorts of people about certain events have been taken very much as an historian would take them, and these opinions have run on all sorts of phenomena—religious, social, political, and economical. In fact, it would have been just as proper to examine Froude, or Lecky, or Gladstone, or Morley, as a great many of the witnesses who have been examined, and the judges are getting up the kind of work for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the French Academy of Moral and Political Sciences occasionally offers a prize, and crowns when approved. The question before them is whether the social and economical revolution which we are witnessing in Ireland was justified by antecedent events, whether it has been effected by means of which the moralist can approve, and whether the chief actors in it can be handed down to posterity as good examples for youth. This is no doubt a useful inquiry to have made, but it is generally conceded that it was absurd to charge three judges with it.

In fact, people are saying now that worse agents for the work than judges could hardly have been selected. What judges are trained in is the art of applying the law to definite issues of fact, carefully made up for them by the bar and stripped of all extraneous matter. For the collection and arrangement of a vast body of heterogeneous information for the use of the statesman, they have no special training at all. The opinion of the Parnell Commission, therefore, on the evidence they have collected will be simply that of three highly respectable elderly gentlemen, from which everybody will feel at perfect liberty to differ. It will not be ridiculous for any layman to say he does not agree with them, as it would have been had they been passing on questions of law. In truth, the summing up of the case of the *Times* by Sir Charles Russell will probably have as much weight with the public as that of the whole case by the judges. Every one agrees that this is a marvellous piece of intellectual work. John Morley, who, although a politician, is one of the severest critics in intellectual matters, places it in the very highest rank of performances of this kind—that is, the marshalling and elucidation of a vast body of heterogeneous facts, some historical, some political, and some economical. The speech has been published in a handsome volume by Macmillan, is having a large sale, and is probably the only product of the Parnell Commission which will really live in history.

Another reason, and a very potent one, which many Americans will find it difficult to appreciate, why the opinion of the judges will not carry great weight, is that lawyers have by no means the standing, as lawyers, in politics in England that they have in America. The English political mind is by no means disposed to assume, as the American political mind is, that a successful advocate must be a good legislator. Successful lawyers here almost invariably make their way into politics, but they there encounter the competition, from which American lawyers are free, of another large class of educated men, who have given more attention to politics than is possible for most busy men at the bar, and many of whom are so placed as to look down on lawyers socially. Consequently the opinion of the greatest lawyer on a political question does not carry half the weight it does in America; but, on the other hand, his opinion on a legal one carries, I am inclined to think, twice as much. Moreover, there is in the Parnell Commission virtually only one judge, Sir James Hannen, and a better judge there could not be. He is learned and able, looks his part to perfection, is a model of patience and good temper, and has a vein of caustic humor to draw on which is invaluable for the repression of turbulence or conceit. The others seldom open their lips. Indeed, Justice Day is said to have spoken only once since the Commission opened, and what he then said was, "Nor I." The report, when it appears, therefore, will be, or be taken as, Sir James Hannen's to all intents and purposes. It might be short, passing categorically on the Pigott letters, and the direct complicity of the persons named in the *Times* pamphlet with actual crime, but I am inclined to think that it will be long, and will, therefore, be somewhat in the nature of an essay on the Irish question, in which each party will find quotations for use on the stump and in Parliament. Probably nobody looks forward to it with much interest except the *Times*, which is naturally extremely anxious for some excuse or justification, however slight, from an authoritative source, for the great boldness of its course.

I was present in court during Sir Charles Russell's examination of Davitt, which was in some respects interesting, as revealing the character of one of the chief actors in the drama. He is a rather small, thin-faced, black-bearded, one-armed man, of a distinctly Jewish cast of countenance, and, as some say (relying on the indication afforded by his name), of Jewish origin. He is the son of an evicted peasant, lost his arm when working in a factory as a child, and has passed ten or twelve years of his life in prison. His black eyes burn deep in their sockets, as the eyes of fanatics are apt to do, and he flames up now and then in a way that makes you glad that he does not feel it his duty to do anything unpleasant to you. Nevertheless, such as he is, absolutely self-taught, he made no mean appearance on the witness-stand, where, according to the cruel and absurd English custom, he was kept standing five or six hours a day while the Attorney-General, Sir Richard Webster, worried him about his whole past life from the age of twenty. His life until the Liberals took up the Irish cause was that of a conspirator. He made no concealment of anything, and sometimes visibly disconcerted the Attorney-General by the frankness of his avowals. I have noticed frequently that Englishmen who are nothing if not loyal to the Crown, are completely upset by the readiness of the Irish to avow themselves "traitors" and "rebels." With that deficiency of imagination which is a national characteristic, they find it difficult at first blush to conceive the state of mind of a man who, born under the Queen, avows openly his contempt for her authority. Then Sir Richard is a bad cross-examiner. He puts on the old bullying *nisi-prius* manner, which in the trial of a political case draws him into frequent scuffles with the witness, in which he is apt to get the worst of it. This occurred with Davitt on several occasions. Davitt got off the stand, on the whole, without damage, except through the production of one very damning letter, which he wrote when he was twenty years old to a brother Fenian who proposed to murder a man for communicating with the police. Not one word of reprobation of the crime does the letter contain. He simply advises the other man not to do it without some one else's permission, knowing, he now says, that the permission would not be given, and, as a matter of fact, the murder was not committed. But the tone of the letter was atrocious, and shocked the public. Probably the most dramatic scene in his testimony was where he avowed his hearty sympathy with the widow Walsh, who urged her innocent son to die on the gallows sooner than give up the actual perpetrator of the murder for which he, the son, had been convicted, and he did so die accordingly. Davitt's passionate adhesion to her view made quite a sensation in the court-room, and really was a flash of lurid light on the course of Irish history. It brought out more clearly than a whole volume of exposition could do the Irish peasant's hostility to the law as foreign law, and his extraordinary obedience to the code of custom which has grown up around the law and in defiance of it.

AN OBJECT-LESSON IN CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM

CANEA, Crete, June 25, 1889.

I HAVE just been studying the effect of the law of rotation in office put into effect by universal suffrage and developed to its logical conclusions. I think the readers of the *Nation* may be interested in the result.

Ten years ago—in 1878, to be precise—the Cretans received a constitution, the fruit of numerous and destructive insurrections of which the history is probably pretty well known to your readers. This Constitution provided a single chamber (the governor being appointed by the Sublime Porte), by the vote of a three-fourths majority of which the Constitution itself may be modified, the modifications as well as the enactments of the Assembly requiring the approval of the Sultan to be effective. By this instrument eighty deputies are elected by the *scrutin de liste*. The judges are elective, each district having a court, and there being no court of appeals. The presidents of the courts, the procureurs and the clerks of the same, are appointed by the Governor-General, together with the *Kaimakams*, or Lieutenant-Governors of the districts. The custom-houses are reserved by the Porte, half the total amount of the duties collected being given to the island treasury by a subsequent concession, and the total direct taxes, which are tithes, belonging to the island. There is a large force of gendarmes enlisted among the population of the island in the proportion of the two religions, Mussulman and Christian, the officers being appointed by the Governor. For a time the arrangement worked very well, the Cretans not having discovered that there was any profit in politics, and being divided by no questions of general policy which required the formation of parties. It was reserved for an astute Governor-General, Christian in politics, to discover the true use of them. The Governor (or *Vali*, as he is entitled), being the survival of the Turkish dominion, and remaining the sole obstacle to complete self-government available to attack, was made the object of all the discontents of all factions and of continual complaints to the Porte—complaints followed by demonstrations in the way of facts—which the Porte appeased by dismissing him.

Photiades Pasha, one of the most capable of that class of Turkish employees whom it is perhaps fitter to call uncircumcised Ottomans than Christians, succeeding to the Valiship, saw in the naturally litigious character of the Cretans the means to distract their attention from him and retain his post by applying the maxim *Divide et impera*. He set secret agents to stimulate quarrels between families, and raise contested claims between adjoining villages or districts. His administrative council, a sort of advisory board to the Vali, contained some of the most capable and unscrupulous intriguers in the island, and aided him to carry out his policy so well that he was appointed for the second term—an isolated case in the annals of constitutional Crete. In this time factions and feuds and fights developed rapidly, and in due course the factions coalesced, as factions will, into parties, on no principle whatever except that of the gravitation of small movable bodies towards each other; and finally two parties were evolved, whose distinctive principles I have not been able to discover, but whose

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

antagonisms have led, I am informed by a late official, to about six hundred political murders down to the present time, besides innumerable killings and mutilations of cattle, horses, asses, stealing and killing of sheep, cutting down of olive trees and vines—the number of olive trees alone cut down being estimated at 40,000 in the entire island. The progress of empire under Photiades was such that he had finally to be thrown to the lions, and the term of office of his successors has not averaged much over a year. Each in his turn espoused the side of one or the other party, and was sacrificed to appease the Opposition.

This state of things made it necessary for the perpetrators of the crimes to have friends at headquarters and in the tribunals, and the judges were of course bound to protect their friends, and the deputies were obliged to look after the workers, while the members of the minority had no justice except in retaliation. The elections were struggles at first to secure protection, and then, as the taste for office grew, to get appointments. Last year the Constitution was amended to confer universal suffrage, and a new, enlarged, and hungrier constituency was let loose for the quest of the privileges of freemen. Fifteen months ago, or just prior to the opening of the last session under the restricted constituency, the present Vali was appointed. The two parties into which the population was divided were nearly equally balanced in the Assembly, one calling itself the "Barefoots," and styling its opponents the "Haversacks"; the former comprising the poorer people generally, and the latter most of the well-to-do islanders. The Barefoots were in a majority of two or three in the full Assembly, and the Governor threw in his lot with this majority.

When the suffrage was made universal, the elections gave scope to more demagogy than had been possible before, and the number of workers who had to be rewarded for their votes and for their works was enormously increased. If it had been difficult to get justice from partisan judges before, it was now much more difficult. The management of the elections was improved, and the falsification of returns was much facilitated and increased, so that the mayors (every commune has its mayor) made no hesitation in giving the certificates of election to the man who had the smallest vote; and where the mayor was on the side of the minority, steps were taken to convert the vote. The procureur made charges of some kind or other against the known partisans of the minority, or Haversack party, on the strength of which they were thrown into prison till the election was over, and others of the same party, having the fear of the law before their eyes, voted straight; and when this was not enough, the Assembly simply rejected the mayor's certificate and invalidated the election of the Haversack candidate, seating their own. At last, and this was in the first week of my visit, some two weeks into the session, they proposed simply to turn the Opposition members out as nuisances, though they were no obstacle to legislation in any sense the majority might desire, for they were only 13 out of 80. Meanwhile, the offices in the gift of the Governor, of which a slight majority had previously been held by the Barefoots, were being rapidly converted, and at present they are held in the proportion of nine to one by the victors. The conversion was proceeding apace when I arrived, the substitutions being made with the very least regard to the efficiency or honesty of the substitutes. A much respected Christian, who had long occupied the position of President of a provincial tribunal, and who could read and write both Turkish and Greek, was dismissed as illiterate, and his place given to a man who could write neither of those languages.

Prior to this campaign the practice of rotation in office on the American plan had not been formally adopted as the rule of government; and the minority, which, oddly enough, and by the confession of both parties, really represents the majority of the population, seeing themselves proscribed and hunted out of all part in the government of the island, determined to rebel. The deputies of the minority joined in a protest, demanded annexation to Greece, and partly withdrew from the Assembly. The outrages all this time were increasing and the authority of the Government diminishing, until no process will run for any crime or suit, the gendarmes cannot effect an arrest, no one will pay his taxes, there is no money in the treasury, and the police have struck or resigned. In fact, there is no recognition of the island Government outside of the walled fortresses. Mass-meetings were held and telegrams were sent to the Sultan, but the Governor stopped them. The Governor and the consuls (who are a very important part of the government of the island) agreed to ignore the complaints and the anarchy and to minimize the importance of the whole matter. The Cretans in reply called meetings and decided to form an *Epitrope*, or general committee of the population. This is an extremely important step in the politics of Crete, and is only taken in view of a general insurrection. This Committee is now in session in the mountains, and, as I write, in negotiations with the Imperial Commissioner who has been sent by the Sultan to investigate the condition of the island. At least three-fourths of the Cretans have taken part in these elections, and the legal Assembly no longer represents the country, but only the office-seekers and the office-holders.

The revolution is overwhelming. The Epitrope has begun to assume the direction of affairs, collecting the taxes and organizing the police, and has really begun to restore order. I have now been here three weeks, and in that time the change in the condition of the island is evident even in our relations with the interior. But the chaos is only less; order is far from restored, and I do not see how it is to be established. The entire interior of the island is under the control of the Epitrope, but the crowding of the office-seekers is undiminished. The last steamer from Candia brought 130 applicants for offices, all of whom had been efficient workers in the last elections, and wanted to be paid. The consuls, in part at least, waking up to the probable consequences of a pressman in their midst, advised the Vali to stop the guillotine, which he did at last; and the Assembly, which had demanded the heads of four Kaimakams among those called for and refused, abolished the kaimakamliks. It then passed an amendment to the Constitution taking the election of the judges from the people and vesting it in the Assembly; and, without waiting for the Porte's sanction to the amendment, went on to appoint the judges under the new law, though not a single appointee could go to his post and the law was worthless till approved by the Sultan.

There is no color of an insurrection against the Sultan, for the demand for the union with Greece is only the usual formula of discontent; but the insurrection, for such it practically is, is against the office-seekers and the office-holders—a revolt against the anarchy resulting from rotten self-government. The demands of the insurgents are, in chief, two: the dismissal of the Vali, who has made himself the chief of a party instead of being the guardian of legality and the holder of the balance between the two parties; and then the amendment of the Constitution in a more conservative sense. That other demands will follow is more than probable, but these are all that have been formulated so far. But I fail to see how this is to restore order and uproot the seeds of anarchy which have been sowing themselves for the last ten years. The rage of parties is such that unless (which is barely possible) there is a healthy reaction established, so strong as to abolish temporarily party distinctions, there is no authority in the island which can remedy the confusion. Should the Porte send troops to enforce order (which is a police function), the whole island will take up arms against the troops; the same would be the case with a force of any other country except Greece, so that it is quite within the possibilities of the case that the Greeks may be called on to keep the peace, and in that case it is also possible that they may keep the island. I do not know how far the present Epitrope, which is the organ of the Opposition, would be able to control the island if it became the official majority. The same rancor of party would probably impel it to persecute the present majority, and so provoke a revolt in turn. The parties are, in normal conditions, in the proportion of two to three in favor of the Haversacks. It was the knowledge of this fact which gave such energy to the revolt; but the minority is still a strong party, and the factions will not fail to rekindle unless the majority are wise, which democratic majorities rarely are.

W. J. Stillman.

SIMON'S 'WILLIAM THE SECOND.'

Berlin, July 11, 1889.

The appearance on the Berlin book-stands of M. Édouard Simon's book, 'L'Empereur Guillaume II. et la Première Année de son Règne,' follows by about three weeks the first anniversary of the accession of the young sovereign. It is intended, as the author says in his preface, to close the series of studies conducted by himself on the contemporaneous history of Prussia and Germany. These studies have hitherto included, as the readers of your paper are aware, a history of the reign of the Emperor William I., a history of Prince Bismarck, and an account of the reign of the Emperor Frederick. In all of these works M. Simon has displayed a fairness of view and impartiality of judgment remarkable in any historian, and perhaps without a parallel in one taking as his subject the policies and men of a country which, within his own time, has humbled and then to a certain extent supplanted his own.

His last work will confirm its author's reputation for impartiality. It is so dreadfully impartial that it is almost uninteresting. If it had been written by the court historian, the brilliant Professor von Treitschke, it could not have been more correct, from the imperial standpoint, and it would have been much less dull. But court historians, I am told, never write—at least not history—and in the absence of any other serious work on this the opening year of what promises to be a long and important reign, let us take M. Simon's book and go over very hastily with him those events of the new reign that have served to mark a tendency by observing which a key to the future may be obtained.

M. Simon indulges in no criticism of a governmental system that makes it possible for a young sovereign of unknown character to throw his country and all Europe into war in order to gratify a personal ambition. With

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the system he is not concerned, only with the application of it under the present ruler. The first half of his book is given up to a sketch of the life of William II. before he came to the throne, and to a brief review of the leading events in the reigns of William I. and Frederick III. as a necessary introduction to those of the present reign. In the field of foreign politics he designates the elder William and Frederick, in a general way, respectively as Russophil and Anglophil; but he does not lay great emphasis on this. The point he seems most anxious to make is, that the administration of Frederick, had he lived, might not have been so liberal as it has come to be supposed. While recognizing the difference of views held by Frederick and his father, he recalls the first year of the old Emperor's reign, when he tried to rule with a Liberal Ministry and failed, and the opinion of Bismarck, that whatever views a Crown Prince may hold, when he comes to the throne he will see that it is only possible for a German Emperor to rule in accordance with the principles of the Conservative party. The one act of Frederick's upon which, in Simon's opinion, the Liberals had a right to build hopes for their future accession to power was the dismissal of Puttkamer; on the other side, in regard to the army Frederick was as much opposed as the old Emperor himself to anything in the nature of parliamentary interference, and his relations to Prince Bismarck were personally and officially cordial in the extreme. As to the return of the conquered provinces to France, there is no reason to suppose that the Emperor entertained such an idea.

There is, perhaps, an historical probability that had the Emperor Frederick lived to grow old in the cares of office, his opinions would have changed in time to the Conservative side. But as against this general probability there is surely little reason to doubt that had he lived in full enjoyment of his health and faculties, he would have sought to apply in practice the liberal ideas which he was known as Crown Prince to have held. M. Simon, in taking into account only his acts as Emperor, when he was too ill to accomplish whatever he may have wished, does him in this matter injustice. Frederick's first public decree (not mentioned by M. Simon in this book), leaving the period of mourning for his father to be settled by the people themselves, instead of setting for it an official limit, showed, at least as clearly as the approval or disapproval of a bill involving complicated interests could have done, the liberal nature of its author. The whole speculation is, of course, a profitless one, and I have dwelt upon it only because it seemed to me to hang well together with a fancied aim of M. Simon's, more creditable to his patriotism than to his historical insight, to which I shall by and by have occasion to refer.

The advent of William II. was accompanied, as M. Simon truly observes, by symptoms of alarm both in and out of Germany; and the new monarch's first words, addressed to his army and navy, instead of, as in the case of both his father and grandfather, to his people, appeared to justify the fears that were felt. The Emperor's words were not warlike, but they were addressed to the war power, and showed that his first thoughts were for that. Three days later appeared the short address to the Prussian people, and not until the meeting of the Reichstag did the sovereign address himself to Germany at large. In this first speech to the Reichstag, as in all subsequent speeches, he assured the world of his intention of following in the footsteps of his grandfather, accepting as a legacy the policies already inaugurated in the reign of William I., among which the two most important—the preservation of peace, and Prince Bismarck's State-Socialistic system of compulsory insurance for the laboring classes—he singled out for his especial approbation. Addressing the Prussian Landtag, he disclaimed any desire to extend the prerogatives of the crown, and promised to protect the liberty of all religious sects. This last assurance, which in any other country except Russia could be considered only as a piece of empty declamation, has unfortunately a practical value in Germany, where a political party stands for the suppression of the Jews. These first manifestations of the new Emperor produced, as M. Simon says, a generally good impression.

About a month after the death of his father, the young Emperor started off on a series of visits to the various foreign and German courts, which he has not yet completed. The object of these visits, as he himself has given out in the course of his speeches, is to cement the peaceful relations existing between himself and their sovereigns, as well as to encourage commercial intercourse between their peoples and his own. The Emperor has thus far visited St. Petersburg, Stockholm, Copenhagen, Dresden, Carlsruhe, Stuttgart, Munich, Vienna, and Rome, and he has yet to visit England and Greece. His reception at each of these places was good, or at least polite. In Vienna the Crown Prince Rudolph was absent from the festivities, but the Emperor Francis Joseph made up for his son's neglect with the most pointed expressions of friendship. In Rome there was a *contretemps* in the form of a shower of red paper scraps bearing the words "Vive la France!" some of which fell into the Emperor's carriage; but the greetings of the populace were unmistakably friendly. The Emperor here showed much tact in his intercourse with King and Pope, and succeeded in getting away without becoming the occasion of any acute unpleasantness. The outcome of the visit to St. Petersburg alone does not seem to have been the desired one. Although William II. is the first German sovereign to speak Russian, this circumstance does not seem to have been sufficient to recommend him to the Czar's affections. The relations between the two countries at the present moment, if one can trust to newspaper expression of opinion on both sides, are decidedly strained; and although a year has now gone by since the Kaiser's visit, nothing definite is given out about the Czar's return of it.

Before the Emperor's departure for St. Petersburg, he accepted with great reluctance Von Moltke's resignation from his active post as head of the army, and found for the aged soldier a lighter task in the Presidency of the Council of National Defence. This led naturally to the retirement of other old soldiers and the advancement of younger officers to the first places in the army. That these changes were made from necessity and out of consideration for the comfort of the older officers, and not at all to introduce more warlike blood into the first rank of the service, M. Simon seems to be justified in informing his countrymen. The cordiality of the Emperor's feelings towards the first soldier of his army does not admit of a doubt.

As regards the great questions of parliamentary government and religious toleration, M. Simon interprets the Emperor's words to mean that he will prefer in both a middle way to extreme measures. At the dinner given by the Chancellor to the members of the Reichstag, the Emperor overturned all the traditions of the Prussian court by attending in person and entering into discussion upon political matters with the representatives of his people. "A new era has begun," he said then. "King as I am, I like to keep up relations with the representatives of the people. My grandfather always remained a stranger to them; but I, for my part, am a child of the new age." This, however, must be taken to mean only that he is fond of discussion. No Liberal, however well-disposed to the Emperor, would maintain that he has any wish to put any more power into the hands of the Reichstag, and M. Simon himself calls him, like his grandfather, a constitutionist and not a parliamentarian. He will try to govern, M. Simon thinks, with the Moderates of both Right and Left, leaving the Progressists and the Reactionaries to go their differing ways. This is, of course, in one sense, the middle way, but it is quite as much, in another, the way of the absolute Conservative, who would keep things just as they are, and only kindly consents not to go backwards.

In questions of the religious order, the anti-Semitic party has been supposed to possess the sympathies of the Emperor, if not his actual support. M. Simon thinks that this cannot be the case, and he quotes a remark of the Emperor's, apropos of this subject, in which he says that he recognizes only patriots and opponents of the national development; that no one will believe him capable of wishing to turn back the wheel of time; that all German legislation is dictated by humanitarian principles; and that whoever refuses to recognize this fact and seeks to stir up the feeling of one class against another, may count upon his disapproval. Yet, if all other indications were wanting, the fact that the royal playhouse in Berlin does not employ Jewish actors, would seem to show that the principle of discrimination against a sect had obtained a footing among State officials presumably not so far removed from the imperial influence. In Church politics, the Emperor's appointment of a man of liberal ideas to a vacant university theological professorship shows that he does not move at the bidding of the extreme and intolerant orthodox party. He is a theologian, perhaps, of the Dr. Bismarck order, and is content to remain by the cardinal doctrine, "We Germans fear God and nothing else in the world."

Towards one party in the State, the Emperor has determined that no one shall mistake the nature of his feelings. Whatever progress may mean, it is not to be construed as meaning anything advocated by the Social-Democrats. They are simply enemies of the State, to be classed in the same category with the French. This convenient classification is sometimes applied by Prince Bismarck to less radical sections of the Liberal party, but it is true that the Emperor would reserve it in the main for the Social-Democrats. His most recent use of the expression (*Reichsfeinde*, foes of the Empire) was in the month of May to the delegation sent to express their grievances by the striking miners of Westphalia. If they maintained themselves in calmness and strict conformity with the law, he told them, he would interest himself in their behalf; but if the strike should prove to be the result of Socialist agitations, he should not be able to examine their demands with patience, and would order a vigorous suppression of their excesses. On the day following he received a delegation of the proprietors of the mines, and read them a lecture on the duty they owed the State to care for the welfare of their laborers, and to prevent the recurrence of such troubles by a wise foresight and an endeavor to admit the workmen to their just share of the benefits. As a result of the Emperor's intervention, a compromise was agreed upon by the miners and their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

employers, and the strike, for the time, came to an end. When M. Simon finished this part of his book, he had not heard of its renewal; but, as we know, the soothing effect of his Majesty's words was but temporary.

While, however, the Emperor has shown himself intolerant of anything like Socialism when carried on among the people themselves, he has been the zealous promoter of the Socialistic system having its origin in the iron power of the State. The passage of the law assuring to invalid and aged workmen an income proportional to the salary they received in the practice of their trade, is an event of importance enough to mark the first year of any reign. Opposed to the end by the representatives of the class for whose benefit it is intended, it was finally adopted, as M. Simon says, "after long hesitations, and on the pressing desire of the Emperor."

To go backwards from the events last mentioned, we must not forget to chronicle the Emperor's conflict with the Liberal press of Berlin. The best known incident of this conflict was the publication of a portion of the Emperor Frederick's diary. All the circumstances concerning this episode are so familiar that it is unnecessary to repeat them here, and it need only be recalled that all the efforts of the Government to have some one punished for the publication came to naught, the courts steadily deciding in favor of the defendants. But the somewhat hostile criticism of the Liberal journals during the first part of his reign, and especially their free speculation upon his former relations to his father and his present ones to his mother, irritated the young sovereign in the extreme, and led to a protest on his part to the Berlin officials when they came to present him with a fountain on his return from his southern visits. He spoke out his indignation very clearly, but, the Liberal journals pretending to misunderstand him, he named them explicitly as the offending members of the press. When this did not silence them completely, a bill was prepared for presentation in the Reichstag the effect of which, if enacted, would be to restore the censorship in its worst form. This bill has not yet been urged upon the Legislature, and whether it has been abandoned, or is being held in reserve for another session, I do not know. M. Simon has made no mention of it whatever.

Two other policies—the building up of a navy and the fostering of a new colonial system—mark the first year of the new Emperor's reign. The first of these has long been a favorite project of his, and he has lost no opportunity of expressing his desire that Germany may become a first-class marine Power. The colonial policy is perhaps a natural outcome of the other; but M. Simon is undoubtedly correct in saying that it originates not so much with the Government as in the sentiment of the people, which is just now under the fascination of the colonial idea. In this matter the Emperor would prefer, as M. Simon puts it, to keep behind rather than to anticipate public opinion.

Apart from Russia and the two members of the Triple Alliance, the two countries whose relations with the German Empire offer the most interest are England and France. More than once since the advent of William II., the grounds for a possible disagreement between the Governments of London and Berlin have been made visible. The disputes in the two closely connected royal families, and the treatment of Sir Robert Morier by Bismarck, have furnished such grounds. Yet the relations of the two Powers have remained friendly, and a compact has been made binding them to joint action in the war against the slave trade on the African coast. M. Simon with justice attributes the avoidance of any break in the relations to the habit of the British Foreign Office of keeping itself free of personal entanglements. In regard to the attitude assumed by the new Emperor to France, M. Simon believes it not to differ from that of his two predecessors. To quote from his book:

"For a long time," he says, "people have been saying that he [the Emperor] is badly disposed towards the French nation. It would, perhaps, be more exact to say that he feels mistrust—a feeling which he shares with his predecessors, and which finds its explanation in the relations created between France and Germany by the war of 1870 and the treaty of Frankfort in 1871."

M. Simon goes on to say that the question of Alsace-Lorraine keeps open a big ditch between the two countries, but that, that question aside, "their diplomatic relations, since the advent of William II., have not lost the correct and courteous character which they had under the two preceding reigns." M. Simon is careful to remind his countrymen, as has been mentioned above, that the intentions attributed to the Emperor Frederick of returning the conquered provinces never had any existence in the mind of that ruler, and that therefore he is not to be preferred on that ground to his son and successor. Whether he is to be preferred on the ground of a greater liberality of mind and general policy, M. Simon has been careful throughout the present volume to express his doubts. M. Simon does not make the pretension, as he informs us, of writing history, in the strict acceptation of the word, of events so close at hand; moreover, he could not write historically of mere matters of speculation. If, then, he seems to strive, in a work not strictly historical, to lay stress upon the doubts he has conceived upon the degree of liberalism that would have marked the reign of a monarch who achieved something like popularity in the land of his enemies, for his supposed liberal tendencies, is there anything unfair in supposing that M. Simon has been actuated in this by a natural and patriotic desire to bring about a less hostile feeling on the part of his countrymen towards an emperor who is not, after all, so different from the one they admired?

In writing of contemporaneous events, there are advantages in living at a distance from the scene of your story, but there are also disadvantages. If M. Simon lived in Berlin, he would notice, unless I am much mistaken, from the mere tone of ordinary conversation, the public consciousness of the changed spirit in the national administration. From Frederick to William was a change from progressive ideas to mere reverence of tradition. So far as a stranger can observe, the Germans do not regret the change, but they recognize it. German society of all classes adapts itself with peculiar readiness to the opinions in vogue at court, and it is from this easy to determine when these opinions have undergone a change. A friend related to me the other day an instance which illustrates the point, and at the same time shows the direction of the last change, in a field apart from politics. A certain gentleman here made his preparations, during the lifetime of the Emperor Frederick, to start a review of literature and belles-lettres (a department in which German periodical journalism is singularly weak). On the Emperor's death, he gave up his intention, giving as his reason that, without the interest he had counted upon in the court, he did not believe that he could make the venture a success.

A little incident, now going the round of the newspapers, shows as well as anything how the Government of William is careful, even in small things, to distinguish itself from that of Frederick. The last-mentioned Emperor changed the name of the palace at Potsdam where he was born from "Neues Palais" to "Friedrichskron," directing that it should always be known by the latter name. As soon as he was in his grave, the old name began to be revived, and it is now given out that the building is to be known again as the "Neues Palais," the order, of course, coming from the Emperor, as without his permission the change of name would be illegal.

M. Simon's summing up is highly favorable to the young Emperor, whose first year of sovereignty he has been reviewing. One year, as he admits, is a short period to judge by, and no final judgment can be passed until he has been seen in the face of trial, which he has not yet had to encounter. But what one can say at present is, that in this first year of office he has avoided the mistakes which many expected to see him commit, and justified the hopes that others felt of his capacity for government.

"This year of début," so M. Simon begins his concluding remarks, "truth compels us to recognize, has not corresponded to the fears to which at first it gave rise; it has rather confirmed the prophecies of those placed within the environment of the future heir to an imperial crown, who augured well of his qualities as a ruler. . . . These fears [that he might disturb the peace of Europe] have happily shown themselves up to the present time to have been without foundation, and nothing gives cause for apprehension that they may be near a realization."

This is true, and the influence the young Emperor has exerted for peace indicates a conquest of himself which is thus far his best title to renown. His reign, which in so many other respects seems likely to be a repetition of that of his grandfather, bids fair to resemble it too in the conscientious regard for duty; he will set, we may hope, and, I think, believe, his duty to Germany above any ambition he may feel to win his laurels on a field of battle.

J. K. P.

FROM NIFFER TO TELLO.—II.

DRESDEN, July 2, 1889.

BOTH Layard and Loftus, in their travels and explorations in Assyria and Babylonia, were possessed with the laudable desire of finding whatever could confirm the historical accuracy of Bible statements, and the latter, I think, was curiously biassed by this desire in his observations about the Bene Rechab, or Sons of Rechab, to whom he devotes the better part of a chapter in his valuable and fascinating work on Chaldea and Susiana. It will be remembered that there was among the Jews at the time of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar a nomadic tribe, the Rechabites, dwelling in tents and abstaining from the use of wine, by the command of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, their father, and that, in consequence of their adherence to this ancestral commandment, Jeremiah used them as the text of a sermon to the Jews, ending with the words (Jer. xxxv. 19): "Therefore thus saith Jehovah Sabaoth, the God of Israel: Jonadab ben-Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." Loftus at once reached the conclusion that the Bene Rechab whom he found along the Shatt-el-Haï were the Rechabites of the Bible. He speaks of them as a very numerous and independent tribe, allied with the great Montefik nation, but governed by an Amir holding a peculiar, almost sacred position. He also lays great stress on the markedly Jewish type of face which distinguishes them even among Semites, and which was the great argument for his identification. In answer to all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my questions I was assured that they were only one of the largest sub-tribes of the Montefik nation, and no one knew anything of the existence past or present of an Amir as their head.

It is so difficult to obtain information among the Arabs of conditions, events, or men of a past generation, that I should, nevertheless, be inclined to accept Loftus's statements regarding the status of the tribe in his day, and suppose a change of conditions since that time; but in regard to the matter of Jewish type I am afraid that he was the victim of mental bias. The Jews have always played an important part in Irak or Babylonia, and they even formed, shortly before the Mohammedan conquest, an independent kingdom in the marshes of that region. There would, therefore, be nothing surprising in the existence of a tribe or tribes with Jewish blood in their veins. But to me (and I found my opinion confirmed by at least one other unprejudiced observer) the Bene Rechab, together with all the Montefik whom I observed, are not only not Jewish in type, but, in marked contrast with the pure Semitic type of the Affek, they present a non-Semitic, or at the least mixed, type. Their faces were generally broader and rounder, the eyes neither so dark nor so liquid, and their noses of no particular shape, and as much or more inclined to turn up than down. In many cases one might suppose that Mongol blood ran in their veins. I may add that similar divergences of type seemed to me to prevail in the towns along the Euphrates. So the Arabs of 'Anah and Hillah present a pure Semitic type, those of the intervening towns, and especially of Hit (ancient Issos), a non-Semitic or mixed type. Similarly, the Armenians present at least two, and I think three, types, one of which is very pronounced in its Semitic character, so that it is frequently impossible to distinguish Armenians from Jews, although the former claim Aryan descent; while another broad, flat-nosed type might even be Tatar.

To return from this ethnological digression, leaving our horses at the camp of the Bene Rechab, and taking the chief with us as guard and guide, we descended the Shatt-el-Haï by boat the very night of our arrival, reaching M. de Sarzec's camp among the 'Atab Montefik at midnight. After our own rough settlement on the barren summit of the Niffer mounds, M. de Sarzec's little village on the shore of the Shatt seemed like a quiet summer retreat, the more especially as his wife, a ten-year-old son, and a French maid accompany him. Tello itself is three or four miles from the camp. Excavations were not in progress on the day of our visit, on account of M. de Sarzec's indisposition, and for the same reason he did not accompany us to the diggings. Outwardly considered, the mounds are very uninteresting, low, and so gradual in outline that it is difficult to determine their real extent. The excavations are neither large nor deep, and from all that I could learn I do not think that any part of the mounds has been thoroughly explored, so that much may still be expected from this site. The antiquities excavated here, as is well known, are the most valuable yet found in Babylonia, and M. de Sarzec has justly acquired his renown as a successful excavator. The determination of this site for excavations was the result not of its identification with a well-known ancient city, for even yet we scarcely know what city stood there, but of the finding by Arabs at this point of fragments of an inscribed statue, and up to the present moment excavations in Babylonia have resembled a game of chance, the ruins of the most famous cities yielding comparatively little to the spade, while this unknown site has yielded treasures of the first importance for the history of civilization.

Our visit to M. de Sarzec was almost enlivened by an Arab war, resulting from the cutting of an irrigation canal, and the village nearest to M. de Sarzec's camp was actually marching to the fray when the gendarmes interfered and sent the combatants home. The peaceful and subdued condition of the tribes along the Shatt-el-Haï, due to a severe chastisement inflicted upon them by the soldiers a few years since, was well illustrated by this incident. Having witnessed a war in the morning, we had a specimen of Arab love-making in the afternoon, on our return voyage up the Shatt-el-Haï. Two Arabs towed our boat by means of a rope attached to the top of the mast. It proved to be an exciting if not perilous mode of locomotion. Sometimes they would stop to clap their hands and dance and sing, and then, when the boat had come to rest and the rope was slack, whether from a sense of neglected duty or of mischief, they would start off again at full speed, almost oversetting us. One of them was in love with a maiden named Chorla, a native of one of the villages which we passed. The sight of this village inspired him to dance and sing, clap his hands and stamp his feet with double diligence, chanting Chorla's praises and proclaiming his own devotion. Arab music is tolerant of almost any words, however unrhythmical, and the laws of composition appear to admit of indefinite repetition, so that while he sang a long time, the words were little more than variations of the one theme: "Chorla, how I love thee! I cannot live without thee!" and an emphatic statement of her worth. Shortly we met Chorla herself walking on the bank, but the coy maiden disappeared within her garments, demurely ignoring both us and her lover. The final act of such a courtship would be the agreement with the parents on the price to be paid for the bride's purchase, although a maiden occasionally elopes without waiting to be bought. Indeed, during our absence from Niffer the daughter of our guide, a maiden of fifteen, who had been offered me for a wife, created much scandal by a runaway match. A self-respecting maiden should prefer to be purchased, and for a high price, as the amount paid is some criterion of her value.

On our way the Bene Rechab chief told of a mound named Jokhah or Yokhah, which he declared to abound in antiquities. According to his account, walls are visible there, and fragments of stone statues and other objects of worked stone abound. As no stone exists in the country, remains of this sort are a favorable indication of the importance of a site. I expressed my desire to visit the site in question, to investigate the truth of this story, but the Bene Rechab refused me an escort, declaring that it was unsafe, being in the territory of the Ez-Zefih, the same tribe which had robbed the Bene Temim a few days before. The offer of double and even treble payment had no effect. I then proposed to go without escort, and offered to give a large backsheesh to any one who would accompany me alone on a swift horse to guide me; but this also was in vain, and I went to bed with an uncomfortable sense of failure. The next day, however, we found our opportunity. On our return journey, near the Mejidieh marshes, we came to a very large camp of Sa'adun Montefik, whose chief, Hamud-el-Bender, pressed us to spend the night with him. I accepted the invitation, on condition that he would give me a guide and an escort to visit Yokhah that afternoon. He did so, and we visited it without accident, although on the return there was an alarm of Ez-Zefih, and most of our escort left us, brandishing their spears and riding in war curves, to chase the supposed enemy, whom I did not see, if they existed. Among these Beduin Montefik, by the way, I saw no firearms, while the Affek, on the contrary, all go armed with the very long-barrelled, old-fashioned Turkish guns of the last century, or somewhat more modern double-barrelled muzzle-loading fowling-pieces.

Yokhah proved to be an extensive mound, but low and partly covered with sand. It lies among the sand-hills, or at least did so at the time of my visit, and a high wind whirled the sand over us in such quantities that we could see but a short distance, and I was unable to make out the general shape of the mounds. There were no fragments of glass or glazed pottery on the surface. We found a couple of brick walls cropping out, the bricks of which looked ancient, but were uninscribed. There were also great quantities of stone fragments, some of them showing worked surfaces; and one larger piece we found, the worked faces of which had been intentionally destroyed, as though to efface something. I found also a number of small fragments of copper. My guides could give me no information about the place, nor of antiquities which had been found there. The surface indications seemed to me rather favorable, but it would be difficult to excavate here at present on account of the distance from water, and also on account of the unsettled state of the country. The same is true of the large mound of Umm-el-Akarib (pronounced Ajarib), a few miles to the southeast, so favorably mentioned by Dr. Ward in the report of the Wolfe expedition; and of El-Hammam, which is about the same distance to the southwest. The latter place is comparatively well known on account of its conspicuous tower of unburned brick, the remains of a *ziggurat*, or stage pyramid, connected with some great temple.

Several important cities of the very earliest period must be sought, it is supposed, in this region, and among others Nisin, a sort of sister city of Nipur, where we have been excavating. Hommel has suggested the identification of Nisin with El-Hammam, but such suggestions in the present condition of our knowledge are almost without value. Tentative excavations at several of these sites would probably settle the question of identity, by bringing to light some inscribed fragments containing the name of the city. Until such excavations can be made, there seems to be little chance of determining what cities lie under the *tels* of Yokhah, Umm-el-Akarib, and El-Hammam. I have already noticed the important fact that, after passing Bismya, the Shatt-en-Nil is said to lose itself in the sand hills by these three mounds.

We spent that night as the guests of Hamud-el-Bender, as we had promised, and were entertained with princely hospitality. He and his tribe belonged to the Sunnite or orthodox Mussulmans, while all the other Arabs whom I had met in Irak were Shiites, or adherents of the Persian schism. The latter are more fanatical, and cannot eat with Christian infidels, or even drink from the same jug from which they have drunk. The Sunnites have no such prejudices, and are perfectly willing to dip their hands in the same dish with Christians. Our host appeared to be a very rich and powerful chief. His camp had more tents than any I have ever seen, and his camels and sheep were beyond number. At the time of our visit wool-peddlers were there buying for Baghdad and Bassorah merchants. The price paid for each

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sheep was said to be four piastres, or sixteen cents, ten sheep out of every hundred being given for nothing. I was also informed that the annual Government tax on each sheep was four piastres, on each camel ten piastres, or forty cents, and on the land, which is claimed as public domain, 50 per cent.

Our return route after leaving Hamud-el-Bender's hospitable tents was for the most part over ground already traversed. The only other mound of very large size which we saw was Tuweyhis, almost due east from Niffer, about in the place assigned on Kiepert's map to Serasoubli. This mound was said by our guide to be larger than Bismya; it should, therefore, be a mound of the first importance. I was unable, however, to check his statements by personal observation, as large canals full of water intervened, and I could not spare the extra day needed to visit it. We reached Niffer Friday, April 5, after an absence of six days.

JOHN P. PETERS.

Correspondence.

THE MARBLE FAUN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The mistake of your correspondent who writes in the *Nation* of July 11 and 18 concerning 'The Marble Faun,' to my thinking, lies in a misapprehension of the book as a whole, and is indicated whenever it is called a "novel." That is exactly what it is *not:* Hawthorne himself, on the title-page, calls it a Romance, and the distinction must be borne in mind; it was never intended as a delineation of actual life in any country, or at any time, and must not be judged from that point of view. The Italy of tradition and poetry, the Italy of those who have never visited it, is a land of dreams and memories, whose long past is ever present, and whose brief present is insignificant. There is abundant evidence that Hawthorne carried with him during his Italian travels this atmosphere of unreality. In the preface to the very book in question he says, "Italy was chiefly valuable to him [the author] as affording a sort of poetic or fairy precinct, where actualities would not be so terribly insisted upon as they are, and needs must be, in America"; and elsewhere in the same preface he says, "The author proposed to himself merely to write a fanciful story, evolving a thoughtful moral, and did not purpose attempting a portraiture of Italian manners and character." Again, he expresses surprise that so much of description should have crept into his story, and explains it by the strong hold of one's mind that artistic and imaginative Italy always takes.

But Hawthorne is too subjective to be held rigidly to local color: in his own way, and of objects that appealed to his peculiar sensibility, he was a keen observer; but of the actual, every-day life of the people around him, he knew less than most men. He does not belong to the modern school of story-writers, and must not be judged by their canons. Had Donatello been an Italian, the criticism that his characteristics are incompatible might be correct—to the Italian of Donatello's nature before his sin, a "New England conscience" is an impossibility; but the answer to all such criticism is, that he was not an Italian, and the mistake lies in seeking an actual prototype for a fanciful character. In the story he is spoken of as belonging to Italy in much the same way that the merchants in the 'Arabian Nights' are assigned to Bagdad: some local habitation is a necessary part of the stage setting, and Italy does better than any other country.

Donatello is not a portrait of any one man, or any dozen men; he is an ideal creation, the embodiment of Hawthorne's speculations as to the purpose of evil. The philosophical motive of the book, in my estimation, is the development of the human mind through the arousing of conscience; it is the use of sin as an educational force. In Donatello the whole drama is portrayed; the other characters of the romance furnish the side-lights. Since the literary form chosen is that of a story, the philosophical ideas must be clothed in human attributes; but that the development of the philosophy may not be hindered by the demands of probability, Donatello is portrayed as just that slightly unreal, faun-like creature, who is human enough to be the hero of a story, and fanciful enough to be untrammelled by the laws of logical development. That he has also the possibility of the Puritanic horror of sin is simply a part of the premise of the argument, and not itself open to discussion. The question of probability Hawthorne has waived by slightly removing his hero from the race of men, by leaving his pointed ears a matter of doubt, by dwelling upon his communion with the birds and the innocent animal life around him; and by so doing he has purposely placed him beyond the reach of our tape-line, and the book of 'The Marble Faun' must be judged as a whole, not as a congregation of characters.

That fanciful blending of the actual and visible world with the unreal, personified images of the imagination is precisely Hawthorne's distinctive gift. To attempt to explain it to one who does not appreciate its charm without an explanation, is as futile as to undertake to elucidate a witticism. There is nothing that I know of in literature, outside the realm of fairy tales, with which to compare 'The Marble Faun'; and perhaps, after all, it is an exquisite kind of fairy-tale adapted to grown-up children, and clothing in fanciful forms the deepest philosophical speculations. Some one has said that Hawthorne never escaped from his inherited Puritanic consciousness of sin: he only succeeded in giving it literary expression; but in no other one of his books is it so vital a part of the work—nowhere else has he treated it so completely or so profoundly.

G. P. D.

CHICAGO, July 21, 1889.

THE DESCENT OF ANNE HATHAWAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If the late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps had regained comparative health, he had promised me to devote more time to the question of the descent of Anne Hathaway. When I began to correspond with him, he was positive that she did not belong to Shottery, and I agreed with him. Since that time I have wholly changed my opinion, and he modified his before he published the seventh edition of the 'Outlines.'

We have two clues to Anne's history, and, so far as I know, only two. The first is, the will of Richard Hathaway of Shottery, dated 1581, which mentions no daughter *Anne*, only a daughter Agnes. Mr. Phillipps tells us that the names Agnes and Anne were interchangeable. Why? Because, under the Norman pronunciation, the *g* was a silent letter, and we find the same person mentioned as Agnes, Annes, or Annis, and often in one instrument. The change from Annes to Anne was very easy, and very likely to be made if there were two of the same name in contiguity. In Richard's will mention is made of a daughter Agnes and a son Thomas, and he then leaves to Agnes and Elizabeth Hathaway "a sheepe apeace of theme." "Daughters of Thomas Hathaway" he calls these, and this could not have been his son Thomas, not yet twenty years of age. Of his own children, only two were grown, namely, Agnes and Bartholomew. This Anne and Elizabeth, daughters of Thomas, seem to have been older, since no condition is attached to his bequest of a "sheepe apeace." May they not have been wards or children of a brother for whom the son was named?

Of this will Fulke Sandells was one of the executors and John Richardson one of the witnesses. The names of these two persons, resident at Shottery, soon appear as Shakespeare's bondsmen in the marriage bond executed November 28, 1582. What more natural, if Anne were really under the care of Richard Hathaway? Two seals were used upon this bond, but only one was lettered. Under the circumstances, may not the R. H. upon this seal be supposed to stand for the Richard Hathaway whose executor Fulke Sandells was at the moment? But why, when Fulke Sandells is named as Fulke Sandells of *Shottery*, is "Anne" called Anne Hathaway of *Stratford?* Is it not possible that, although in some way under the care of Richard Hathaway, she was and had been for some time in the employ of John Shakspere at Henly Street?

There is still another clue to Anne Shakespeare in this will. Richard Hathaway desires that a debt of four pounds, six shillings and eight-pence be paid to his shepherd, Thomas Whittington. Ten years after, in April, 1601, this same shepherd of the Shottery farm died and left in his will to the poor people of Stratford forty shillings "that were in the hande of Anne Shaxspere, wife to Mr. William Shaxspere." So Anne at least had not then lost sight of Shottery.

Now for Lady Barnard's will. In January, 1570, she leaves handsome legacies to the daughters of her "kinsman Thomas Hathaway," a joiner, then living at Stratford. Of the five Hathaways mentioned, two are named Elisabeth and Joan. Joan was the name of Richard's wife at Shottery, and he had a daughter Elisabeth. A third is named Rose, and the Register of Burials at Stratford enters "Rose, daughter to Thomas Hathaway, buried November 1, 1582." Not too creditable a person, this Rose, to judge by other entries. Lady Barnard applies the word "kinsman" to the Hartts as well as to this Thomas Hathaway. The Hartts were the grandchildren of her grandfather's sister. Why may not Hathaway have been the grandson of her grandmother's brother, all of them being cousins to herself "twice removed"?

Mr. Phillipps thinks there was no connection between the Thomas mentioned in Richard's will and Richard's own family. He gives no reason, and it seems to me an arbitrary decision. No one of the above suggestions would have any value of itself, but, taken together, they seem to me to have weight.

CAROLINE HEALEY DALL.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS., July 20, 1889.

THE EXCAVATIONS AT DELPHI.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just seen the letter of Dr. Waldstein in reply to mine on the excavations at Delphi. I have no intention to enter into a controversy on the subject, but will simply say that I showed my letter in the *Nation* to M. Foucart and to the French Minister at Athens, M. Montholon, and they both declared it to be absolutely exact. It was, indeed, written on the information of the former gentleman, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did not pretend to go further than the statement of the French side of the question, and for this there was no need to go to Dr. Tarbell or even Dr. Waldstein.

Dr. Waldstein seems to have accepted the assurances of the Greek Government with a naïveté which, to those who know it, is amusing, but he was distinctly informed that the French School and Government had not withdrawn, and did not mean to withdraw, their claims to the concession of the excavation of Delphi. Moreover, the Greek Government has granted the concession to the French School on condition of the conclusion of a treaty of commerce, which condition was accepted by the French Government; and though the present Chamber of Deputies has refused the law, it remains only in abeyance until another Chamber is elected, which will be before long. It is nonsense, then, to talk of the French being excluded. The French Minister has made the interference of Mr. Fearn, our Minister, the subject of a formal representation to his own Government, requesting it to ascertain from the Government at Washington if it has the intention of entering into the competition for the work at Delphi against the French School.

As to the terms, I can state another fact, which Dr. Waldstein seems to be ignorant of, which is that, when the concession was offered to the French School, it was with the condition that the Greek Government was to pay for the expropriation up to a certain amount, but that when Mr. Fearn came in to ask for the concession the Greek Government informed Foucart that they had now a better offer, and that if the French wanted it, they must pay also the expropriation, and must, moreover, purchase the entire village (of which a part, being founded on rock, was not required for the excavations), and, when the excavation was finished, must make over the site to the Greek Government besides the entire product. That part of the site which it is known contains the temple is worth, according to the estimate of Foucart, about the sum I stated. The condition that the French Government should acquire the entire village, with compensation for all the improvements which the inhabitants have been rushing up since they heard that the American millions were coming into the affair, is the result of the American intervention, and shows that the Greek Government has a good eye to business; but I am much mistaken if the flagrant dishonesty of the proceeding will meet American ideas of fair dealing or finance.

The only reason why "these excavations ought to be undertaken soon" is that the Greeks are trying to make as much as they can out of them by additional constructions on the site, which they expect the Americans or the French will have to pay for in addition to what was there when the negotiations commenced. It is now many years since the French began to urge the work, and they have always been ready to undertake it on terms which would have been considered most liberal by any people which had not been accustomed to consider its archæology as a matter for speculation and money-making. The Archæological Society of Athens, which comprises all there is in Greece of real devotion to the archæology of the country, has always opposed the concession of Delphi to anybody but itself, and it has always made its views prevail. If, in the interest of science, it is necessary that the excavation of Delphi should be done at once, the best course would be to intrust the funds for it to that Society, which will do the work for the half of what it would cost the American School, and do it without any heartburnings, while the concession to the American School, even if there were a chance of its being so given, would involve our being implicated in what I must consider the disgraceful conduct of the Greek Government towards the French School, which has merited the gratitude of Greece by its disinterested labors on the archæology of Greece for many years, and to a greater extent than all other agencies combined, except, perhaps, the Archæological Society.

If Dr. Waldstein, before writing his letter to the *Nation*, had gone to M. Foucart and ascertained the position of the French School in the matter, he would, I think, have been spared the letter, for he would have found that the Greek Government had concealed the true state of the matter, and that it would not have been possible for our school to accept the concession without a violation of international courtesy. It was of M. Foucart, as head of the French School, and M. Montholon, as the representative of the French Government, that he was bound to ascertain the position of the French claim, and not of the Greek Government, which was simply using the Americans to extort better terms from the French. In proof of this I could state facts which would not be as pleasant as those I have stated, and which would show that the American School has really no chance of getting the concession under circumstances which would permit us in common decency to accept it, if at all. Scientific morality absolutely forbids us to move any further in this matter until the French are out of the way.

I could say more, but I think that ought to be enough. I was perfectly aware of all the facts that Dr. Waldstein thinks I ought to know, and some that he evidently does not.

Yours truly, W. J. STILLMAN.

VENICE, July 12, 1889.

THE GRAND RAPIDS POST-OFFICE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Unintentionally, no doubt, the Civil-Service Commission, and you, following, hardly with your usual care, the report of the Commission, in your comments on "charges of violation of the Civil-Service Law in the Post-office at Grand Rapids, Mich.," in your issue of July 25, do the Postmaster here, Mr. James Blair, a great injustice. No fault certainly can be found with the action of the Commission in regard to the case of F. A. Hudson, Chief Clerk of the Railway Mail Service for this district of the Ninth Division of that service. It was certainly impartial, and all that the Commission, with its too limited powers, could do. But the report of the Commission leaves the impression on the average reader that the case is quite directly and necessarily connected with the management of the Post-office here, and that Postmaster Blair is therefore responsible for it. In the published report of the Commission it says:

"The only affidavit affecting Mr. Blair is that of McConville, which asserts that Mr. Blair was present in the Government building at Grand Rapids one day in October, 1888, and assisted Clerk Hudson in attempting to extort from him (McConville) a contribution of money for political purposes. On this point his affidavit is unsupported by any others, while it is explicitly contradicted by the affidavits of both Mr. Blair and Mr. Hudson, and the Commissioners do not consider that it is in itself sufficient to warrant their asking action to be taken thereon."

Even if this part of the report of the Commission had stated that Mr. Blair in his affidavit declared that he did not know McConville even by sight, had never met him or seen him, and never had such a conversation with Mr. Hudson as McConville swore to, in the presence of McConville or any one else, the paragraph would still carry to the mind of the reader the idea that it was the Grand Rapids Post-office and Mr. Blair that were being investigated. And in your comments on the case you not only speak of "charges of violation of the Civil-Service Law in the Post-office at Grand Rapids, Mich., under the present Democratic Postmaster," but you add, "Half-a-dozen clerks in the office have made affidavit that F. A. Hudson, the Chief Clerk during the campaign of 1888, demanded contributions to the Democratic campaign fund."

This is said clearly under a total misapprehension of the case. The facts briefly are these: The Grand Rapids Post-office was not, until after the recent visit of the Civil Service Commission, at which time a local examining board was appointed, in any way under the control of the Civil-Service Commission. The Commission therefore made no pretence of examining the management of the office. The Railway Mail Service is under the control of the Commission, and the charges against Mr. Hudson, Chief Clerk of the Railway Mail Service, were investigated, as they should have been. Mr. Hudson, as Chief Clerk of the Railway Mail Service, is in no sense an attaché of the Grand Rapids Post-office, and the Postmaster here has no more to do with his official acts, good or bad, with his performance or violation of duties or rules or laws, than the Postmaster at Kalamazoo or Detroit has. The two branches of the service are entirely distinct. None of the "clerks in the office" made affidavits regarding the case. The affidavits were made by postal clerks and ex-postal clerks in the Railway Mail Service, who are in no way connected with the Post-office here. It seems to me that the Commission, in its report, should have made this fact clear, instead of leaving it to be inferred that the civil-service laws had been violated in the management of the Grand Rapids Post-office.

That this error should have been made, I think, is to be especially regretted because Mr. Blair, since he became Postmaster in November, 1885, has scrupulously followed the letter and spirit of our civil-service laws, as an appointee of ex-President Cleveland, although there is no such public feeling here or anywhere in the West regarding the importance of the civil-service laws as there is in the East. That this is so is shown by the fact that of the thirty-six employees in the office when Mr. Blair became Postmaster, eighteen are still in the employ of the office. Changes have only been made to fill vacancies caused by resignations or removals for cause. Not a single change has been made in the personnel of the office for political reasons. I do not believe any post-office in the country can give a better record, from a civil-service-reform standpoint, than can the Grand Rapids Post-office under the management of Mr. Blair, and I regret very much that the Commission, in making a report upon alleged violations of law in the Railway Mail Service, should have made it appear, unintentionally, no doubt, but to the great delight of some local Republicans who are anxious to have a change made at once in the Postmastership, that there has been something wrong or questionable in the management of the Grand Rapids Post-office, when such is not the case. And of this fact the Commissioners themselves were, I have good reason to believe, fully satisfied from what they learned during their visit here. Very truly yours, F. W. BALL.

GRAND RAPIDS, Mich., July 26.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW ENGLAND BURNINGS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: "J. C. N.," in his interesting letter on witch-burning in the *Nation* of July 25, commenting upon the negro-burnings cited by you in your note on the same subject in the *Nation* of July 11, says that "those old Puritans showed a ghastly gallantry, sending the women to the flames, the men to the gallows." This was a gallantry, however, by no means peculiar to our Puritans. It was a part of the English law which they brought to this country with them. "In treasons of every kind," says Blackstone in his 'Commentaries' (vol. iv., p. 93), "the punishment of women is the same, and different from that of men. For as the decency due to the sex forbids the exposing and publicly mangling their bodies, their sentence (which is to the full as terrible to sensation as the other) is to be drawn to the gallows and there to be burned alive." And he might have remarked in this connection quite as well as in any other, "So great a favourite is the *female sex of the laws of England.*"

The last of the two negro-burnings which you mentioned, namely, that at Cambridge, Mass., on September 18, 1755, was clearly for the crime of petit treason, committed when a servant kills his master (25 Edw. III., c. 2). Of the punishment for this crime Blackstone again says (vol. iv, p. 204): "The punishment of petit treason in a man is to be drawn and hanged, and in a woman to be drawn and burned, the idea of which latter punishment seems to have been handed down to us by the laws of the antient Druids, which condemned a woman to be burned for murdering her husband [another form of petit treason], and it is now the usual punishment for all sorts of treasons committed by those of the female sex." It was not till 30 Geo. III. c. 48 that mercy tempered the delicate but cruel justice of the old law, and the punishment of women in all cases of high and petit treason was changed to simple drawing and hanging.

In regard to the case of the two negroes executed for arson September 22, 1681, it may be that the life destroyed by the woman was her master's, in which case her crime would have amounted to petit treason, and burning would have been the appropriate punishment according to the rule above stated. If, as "G. L. B." suggests, it was "a rude attempt to suit the penalty to the crime," it is difficult to see why a distinction should have been made in favor of the male negro. Burning was equally well suited to his crime. Perhaps, by some confusion of ideas, the rule prescribing different punishments for the sexes in cases of high and petit treason was extended to these two cases of arson.

But even if this burning was only a rude attempt to suit the punishment to the crime, it would not stand without precedent and authority. To quote from Blackstone a third time (vol. iv., p. 222): "The punishment of arson was death by our antient Saxon laws, and in the reign of Edward the First this sentence was executed by a kind of *lex talionis;* for the incendiaries were burned to death; as they were also by the Gothic constitutions."

It would seem that the aspersions which have been cast on the Puritans for their burnings ought rather to fall on the laws of England.

R. D. Weston-Smith.

Boston, July 27, 1889.

SHORT TERMS OF OFFICE DANGEROUS TO PRIVATE RIGHT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Under the above heading you published an article from Mr. C. C. Binney which, as a criticism upon the opinion of Judge Holt of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky, in City of Covington vs. Hoadley, 83 Ky. 444, "misses the ford," as we say in the State. The action was to recover taxes erroneously assessed and collected, and, as the charter of the city of Covington contained a clause limiting the time in which such an action could be brought to six months, the court simply held, Judge Holt delivering the opinion, that the Legislature could constitutionally enact such a statute.

Mr. Binney seems to think that a claim based upon a contract *or tort* can be asserted within five years in this State; yet this is not true, as all actions for injury to the person, malicious prosecution, libel, slander, etc., must be brought within one year. This same clause of our statute of limitations prescribes the same time as that within which an action for killing stock by railroads shall be moved; yet, by a provision of the charter of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, for such killing the limitation as to that company is six months, and this has been upheld as a proper and constitutional exercise of legislative power, with probably a fairer field of criticism than that chosen by Mr. Binney.

Mr. Binney says, contrasting the different times prescribed as against a private person and the city of Covington: "A valid claim against an individual or corporation cannot stand upon any really higher ground than one against a municipality; yet *Judge Holt would apply* a wholly different rule in the two cases." This is not true. It was not Judge Holt's province to make the law; that belonged to the Legislature. He simply decided upon the power of the Legislature to make such a law or not. He may be in error as to the reasons moving the Legislature to act. More likely his error, if any, consists in guessing out only a part of those reasons. But he may be pardoned if he failed to give the whole of them, since there are many acts of the various Legislatures—and some of them touching the very question of limitations of actions—to find any reason for which one ought to be considered fortunate.

William L. Dulaney.

Bowling Green, Ky., July 22, 1889.

WORKS ON HUMAN ANATOMY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In the review of Prof. Leidy's 'Anatomy' in the *Nation* of last week, while full justice is done to that work and its author, there occurs an oversight in regard to his predecessors, when it is said that his first edition, appearing twenty-eight years ago, "then formed the only original American compendium of human anatomy."

The library of the Pennsylvania Hospital contains, as shown by its catalogue, the following works: 'A System of Anatomy,' 2 vols., by Caspar Wistar, M.D., three editions, 1811, 1814, and 1825; 'A Treatise on Special and General Anatomy,' 2 vols., by William E. Horner, M.D., 1826; 'An Illustrated System of Human Anatomy, Special, General, and Microscopic,' by Samuel George Morton, M.D., 1849.

Caspar Wistar, M.D., was Professor of Anatomy in the University of Pennsylvania from 1809 to 1818. Dr. William E. Horner followed him in the same chair, though not immediately, occupying it from 1831 to 1853. Dr. Samuel G. Morton was Professor of Anatomy in the Pennsylvania Medical College from 1839 to 1843. Wistar contributed at least one original observation to anatomical science, that of the before undescribed triangular processes on the posterior part of the ethmoid bone of the head, sometimes called, after him, the pyramids of Wistar. Horner discovered the *tensor tarsi* muscle of the eye, which facilitates the flow of tears from the eye to the nose. Wistar's most important work was his elaborately illustrated 'Crania Americana,' a very valuable contribution to American ethnology.

Respectfully, H. Hartshorne.

Philadelphia, July 23, 1889.

[The works named should certainly not have been ignored, although, perhaps, even that of Morton had become somewhat out of date at the time Dr. Leidy's treatise was published.—Ed. Nation.]

RUINOUS FREE TRADE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I read in *Engineering* (London), for July 12, p. 46, col. 2, as follows:

"The wages of the northern steelworkers have been advanced another 2½ per cent., in accordance with the report of the accountants for the past three months. This will make 7½ per cent. above what is called the standard rate, and will remain in force, as the price to be paid, during July, August, and September.

"In the Midlands the price of iron has still an upward tendency, the prices having been advanced 10s. per ton during the past week. *This advance in price will affect the wages of* the work-people, who, like the steelworkers, will reap some advantage from the rise in the market price of iron."

In your issue of July 18, 1889, I find that Carnegie's men have had *their* wages *reduced* 20 per cent. I leave you to make the comments.

Low-Tariff Democrat.

Washington, D. C., July 26, 1889.

Notes.

In enumerating, last week, the works of the late Prof. Alexander Johnston, it seems we did not exhaust the list. Henry Holt & Co. announce that he left in their hands, ready for the press, a second 'History of the United States,' written on a plan somewhat similar to that of his text-book bearing the same title, "but suited to a shorter course, and perhaps to less mature minds."

D. C. Heath & Co. will shortly publish 'Modern Facts and Ancient Fancies in Geography, a Handbook for Teachers,' by Jacques W. Redway; and 'Topics in Geography,' in seven grades, by W. F. Nichols.

Ginn & Co. publish in August a 'General History,' by P. V. N. Myers, President of Belmont College—a condensation into 700 pages of his well-known 'Ancient History' and 'Mediæval and Modern History.'

A compilation of articles by Susan Coolidge, Arlo Bates, and other writers will form a handsome volume, called 'The Coast of Maine,' to be published by Henry G. Peabody, Boston. It will be illustrated by fifty photogravures of scenery.

A special product of the Maine coast comes to us in the 'Annual Index to Periodicals for 1888 [brought down to July, 1889]' (Bangor: W. M. Griswold). It is the seventh of the compact "Cumulative Indexes," subsidiary to Poole, invented by Mr. Griswold, and embraces thirty-four periodicals, mostly American.

The London *Publishers' Circular* states that of Bryce's 'American Commonwealth' the first English edition of 2,500 copies is nearly exhausted, and that 10,000 copies of the American edition have been sold in this country. "We understand," it adds, "that a second and revised

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

edition of the book may be looked for in the early autumn."

The New England Historic-Genealogical Society have just reissued separately Mr. Henry F. Waters's more recent 'Genealogical Gleanings in England,' as part 3 of vol. i. Miss Susan B. Kidder has equipped it with indices of persons and of places, thus perfecting the usefulness and heightening the fascination of the 'Gleanings' for whoever is interested in this kind of research, or, we will add, in the friendly drawing together of Englishmen and Americans which it promotes. Mr. Waters is now, by reason of his brilliant discoveries in the case of John Harvard, Roger Williams, and Washington, conspicuous as the very wizard of genealogical divination; but one who runs through the pages before us must be struck with the ever-broadening base of solid induction which he builds incidentally, for the future elucidation of much humbler pedigrees. The fund for the support of Mr. Waters's arduous explorations still needs to be fed by public-spirited contributions, and these may be made through the Society.

A fourth edition of J. J. Bond's standard 'Handy Book of Rules and Tables for Verifying Dates with the Christian Era' has recently been added to Bohn's Reference Series (New York: Scribner & Welford).

We learn from the *Athenæum* that a small collection of memorial records of the late Prof. Sheldon Amos has been privately printed for circulation among his friends.

'A Dictionary of American Politics, Comprising Accounts of Political Parties, Measures and Men, etc.,' by Everit Brown and Albert Strauss (New York: A. L. Burt), deserves mention, even if long delayed, for the good faith of the undertaking; but the compilers were in no sense qualified for selection, definition, or accurate statement. The very first page (Abolitionists) is full of error and misleading suggestion. In one paragraph on page 233 four out of six dates are wrongly given. The faults of the scheme are many. The book is perhaps not worthless, but it is absolutely untrustworthy.

The preface to Prof. A. N. Van Daell's 'Pages Choisies des Mémoires du Duc de Saint-Simon' (Ginn & Co.) will conciliate many readers. He addresses it not only to teachers of French, but to "others also, who, as principals or in any different capacity, have something to do with the choice of text-books." "The study of a foreign language," he says, "ought to bring students in contact with the master-minds of foreign nations. Students ought to grasp ideas and feelings with which the writers of their own nationality cannot make them acquainted. Unless this result is obtained, it seems to me that the time given to French or German is wasted." He thinks the French and English literatures "particularly well-fitted to balance each other." The annotations are in French.

A monograph on the Cathedral of Milan and the designs for the façade ('Il Duomo di Milano, e i Disegni per la sua Facciata') has been prepared by Camillo Boito, with an extensive pictorial accompaniment in lithography and photogravure, and a trial bibliography by F. Salveraglio (Milan: L. De Marchi). Boito argues for the amalgamation of foreign and Italian design in the building, rejecting its derivation from Lombard architecture.

"English Culture in Virginia" is the attractive title of a double number in the seventh series of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. The writer, Prof. W. P. Trent, does not awaken curiosity for nothing. He has to tell of the founding of the University of Virginia by Jefferson, and of the efforts to procure professors from abroad. The particular sources are the letters and papers of Francis Walker Gilmer, Jefferson's emissary for this purpose. Prof. Trent notices with amusement the outcry raised against the unpatriotic neglect of home talent. The Boston *Courier* applauded the proper remark of the *Connecticut Journal*, that no American could read of it without indignation. The Philadelphia *Gazette* was of the same mind, and thought "this sending of a Commission to Europe to engage professors for a new university is, we think, one of the greatest insults the American people have received." We manage this thing much better nowadays, under the joint rule of Protection and Labor: we keep these interlopers from landing by law, or send them back if they are detected.

The *Library* for June gives an interesting account of the library of Ralph Thoresby, the topographer; and an article on "American Books with English Title-pages" criticises severely the common custom of importing books printed and published in America, and issuing them with title-pages which bear only the London imprint and the name of an English publisher. The writer thinks it strange that, in this protest against a sham, he should have to arraign, as one of the earliest offenders, that arch-antagonist of shams, Thomas Carlyle, who writes to Emerson in 1838, with reference to the 'Miscellanies' of the latter, "Why not have 200 or 300 of the American edition struck off, with 'London: Saunders & Ottley,' on the title-page, and sent over hither in sheets?" This reprehensible custom, however, is not confined to English publishers, for American firms are also in the habit of importing English books and issuing them with only an American imprint on the title-page. In the July number of the *Library* the most important paper by far is Mr. Blades's article on "Paper and Paper-marks," which should be read and digested by every bibliographer. Mr. Pollard calls the attention of English librarians to Miss Hapgood's entertaining account of her experiences in the St. Petersburg Library, narrated in the *Nation*, No. 1238, and gives a long extract from her description of Russian library methods. In the notes the editors remark that they have received more than one plaintive letter from young librarians, appealing for help in the shape of papers on methods of work, and wonder why American librarians should have almost a monopoly of that kind of writing.

The greater portion of the June and July numbers of the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* is taken up by the continuation of Schultze's paper on the influence of the Scotch-Irish monks on mediæval culture, and the first two instalments of Ortroy's Belgian military bibliography for the year 1887. In the June number, however, Dr. Falk gives some interesting facts concerning Ivo Wittig, and declares that there is no foundation for Hessels's confident assertion that Wittig was a relative of Gutenberg, which was put forth as a reason for discrediting his testimony in favor of Gutenberg. Those librarians who are fortunate enough to possess a copy of the catalogue of MSS. on vellum from the Hamilton Palace collection, described in the *Nation* No. 1242, will be glad to know that the July number of the *Centralblatt* contains a complete list of the purchasers and the prices obtained at the recent sale of the collection in London. The ninety-one lots brought a little over $75,000, Quaritch carrying off the lion's share. He purchased twenty-seven manuscripts at a cost of over $33,000; of the four lots which ran up to $5,000, or above that, he secured three, one of them being the famous Anglo-Saxon MS. of the Gospels, on purple vellum, for which he paid $7,500 and now asks $12,500. Karl Trübner of Strassburg appears as the purchaser of a number of valuable specimens, and Dr. Goldschmidt of Frankfort carried off six at a cost of about $15,000, among them the beautiful MS. of Boccaccio's 'Les Illustres Malheureux,' for which he paid $8,500. The Royal Library of Berlin made an effort to secure 'Der Wälsche Gast' of Thomasin von Zirclaria, but was outbid by Quaritch, who gave $1,700 for it.

The extraordinary engineering of the new toothed railway up Mt. Pilatus is described, with effective cuts, in the latest number of *Vom Fels zum Meer* (*Heft* 11, 1888-89) we have received from F. W. Christern. Its maximum gradient (25° 39′) is alleged to be the steepest yet attempted with this sort of road. The ascent takes an hour and twenty minutes, and involves the passage of several tunnels and one arched viaduct over a frightful gorge between two tunnels. The cost of constructing the nearly three miles amounted to some $380,000.

—*Scribner's* for August presents two portraits of Tennyson and also a brief and discreet account of the poet's first venture, in company with his brother Charles, into the world of letters. Prof. Lounsbury concludes these Tennysoniana by a criticism, or rather comparison, of the two "Locksley Halls," in which he sustains those who think that the last of these is a poem quite the peer of the earlier verses, though necessarily inferior to it in public interest. Prof. Lounsbury, in our judgment, might well have said more than he ventured on in praise of the art, the dignity, the power, and especially of the wiser temper and doctrine of the last utterance of the poet upon his times. The remainder of the magazine contains two prominent sporting articles, one upon lawn-tennis and one upon tarpon-fishing in Florida, each of which has its especial readers. The paper upon electric lighting, with its multiplicity of illustrations, is also prominent and useful to a wider circle. The rest of the number is occupied with fiction, in which Mr. Stevenson holds his own, and Mr. Brander Matthews gives a romance on a common motive, and artistically frames the Rome of a young man's first love in the setting of a Dakota blizzard on Christmas, with its necessity to go search for the lost "kids" as a finale to the soldier lover's buried life. "A Pagan Incantation," by Boyesen, is too uncanny, and, being mere fancy—almost a ghost story—racks the reader's sensibilities in an utterly merciless manner. The other stories sink into commonplace.

—The midsummer *Century* is adorned, as is usual, with a large number of woodcuts, but the most beautiful of them are those which seem to be given as a sort of challenge by the group of "painter-engravers" who, in a series of short articles—"Originality in Wood-Engraving," by Kingsley; "Painter-Engraving," by Closson, and "The New School of Engraving," by J. P. Davis—plead for the rights of wood-engraving as an art for its own sake, and not merely for reproduction and commercial purposes. These papers, with their evidence of enjoyment in the artist's life, show plainly enough the sensibilities of the artistic temperament; and if wood-engraving is to be employed in the way indicated, it could not have better friends than men so strongly endowed with feeling and with technical skill as are these masters of the art. The success which they have obtained is sufficient proof of what they can do to accomplish their ambition, and the effects are marvels; but if we read rightly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what they say, it is to the proof upon Japan paper that they specially point in claiming wood-engraving as a painter-art. Their contention has, in so far, more relation to the arts of luxury than to that popular art which wood-engraving is commonly engrossed with; but even if the best results are thus limited to the few, comparatively speaking, those which can be rendered on the magazine page are also delightful to the eye. These landscapes and the fine portraits of French's preceding article, together with the three engravings after Fra Angelico by Cole, and the portrait of Tennyson by Johnson, taken together, represent the art at its best, and illustrate its excellence in whatever way it turns its graver. We have left space only to mention the text. The papers upon the poison of serpents, the Biblical element in Tennyson, Mr. Kennan's distressing account of the Kara prison, relieved by a tribute to one humane and heroic Russian official; "Artist Wanderings among the Cheyennes," with some unfavorable comment upon the present mode of educating a few boys to relapse into savagery, and also a word in favor of placing the Indians under the War Department, are the most noticeable in a number of unusual interest.

—*Harper's* continues its Russian articles with an elaborately illustrated account of the Kremlin, in which the cuts usefully exhibit objects of Russian art to the eye; and Abbey and Parsons make up a second picture-article in their marked style, to which some well-timed verses by Austin Dobson are attached. The remainder of the number affords a variety of commonplace of the usual sort, in which the most interesting piece of information is the brief description of Mexican lustred pottery, and the hope held out that the lost art of the Italian workers of the sixteenth century, and their brothers, the Saracens, may be recovered. The secret of this lustre has been sought for without success by the moderns. Mr. Warner, however, found by chance something resembling the old art in a shop in Mexico, and a friend whom he put upon the scent discovered the village and the kiln whence it came, and learned the nature of the process from the Indians who were at work upon it. The writer attributes this success in winning the confidence of the shy and secretive native potters to their mistaking her for a nun. The process, at all events, affords hints for European experiment. The other prominent papers are a panorama of court-day in Kentucky, the history of the Fan, and a labored analysis of the movement of religious thought in Germany, with special attention to the present state of theology, church parties, and materialism and the empire. Photography also receives attention in two papers, and gives occasion for an admirable centennial portrait of Daguerre, as authentic as any in existence, being from a daguerreotype.

—Mr. Lowell opens the August *Atlantic* with a long philosophical poem, in which he makes the memory of his sister's gold-fishes in his boyhood an occasion for drawing a pleasing analogy between the world outside their watery horizon as it appears to them, and that beyond our senses as we sometimes fancy it appears to us. The conceit is sketched out partly in a thoughtful, partly in a reminiscential vein, and no other poetry is allowed to mar the effect. The classical papers to which we have so often had the pleasure of calling attention are continued by an admirable account of the localities which make the background of Virgil in the landings of Æneas on Italian soil and in the Latin War—an article so entertaining in itself, and marked by such refined sensibility to the qualities of Virgil, as to renew in our minds for the hundredth time the wonder why the secret of this poet is so seldom disclosed until after school and college days are over. The common lack of appreciation of Virgil is the capital instance of the sterilizing power of pedagogy, and a lamentable one it is too. Mrs. Wyman, in "From Generation to Generation," gives an interior view of the home-life of a Garrisonian Quaker family, which is remarkable for its success, not only in detailing little incidents, but especially in giving the atmosphere and tone—that impalpable, pervasive, and constant element in an humble family life which can be caught and rendered only by rare good-fortune. She writes her story as an illustration of changes in New England life, not egoistically, and as such it has historical value. The remainder of the magazine offers a critical and appreciative account of the Canadian poet, Louis Honoré Fréchette; a careful paper upon the theory of sovereignty in our Constitution, and legal decisions and public opinion under it, and instalments of Bynner's and James's serials.

—The opening notice in the eighteenth volume of Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan) is a good instance of the readability of this work. James Esdaile (1808-1859) was a Scotch physician who went to Hooghly, India, for hospital work, and there practised mesmerism in painful operations with a success which led to Government's placing him in charge of a small hospital for further experiment, and finally promoting him. The appearance of ether and chloroform on the scene in 1848 put an end to the more laborious method of producing anæsthesia, and, for the rest, he found the process too exhausting when applied to the less susceptible Scotchmen at home. A few pages further on, in the notice of John Bishop Estlin, an eminent surgeon of Bristol, uncle by marriage to the economist Walter Bagehot, we read of his 'Remarks on Mesmerism' in 1845, "a lucid exposition of the scientific method of investigating phenomena said to be due to hidden forces of nature." Such glimpses of past opinion abound in this admirable work. Faraday is most honored by allotted space in this volume, having twelve pages from the hand of Tyndall, whose skill is striking. Mr. Stephen himself returns to familiar themes in writing on Fielding in upwards of seven pages, and in condensing his Life of Fawcett into four and a half. Guy Fawkes seems liberally supplied with three. In the nineteenth volume, which ends with Forman, the astronomer Flamsteed gets seven pages, John Fletcher a little more, and Flaxman five. At the other extreme, there is a brief account of Margarie Fleming, with a suggestion that her life was probably the shortest of any commemorated in this Dictionary; and Fleta is inserted, for the sake of saying that it is the name of a book and not of a person. Under Mrs. Fitzherbert we are told that the Messrs. Coutts have a strong-box confided to them in 1833, containing her certificate of marriage to the Prince of Wales (George IV.), and other interesting documents which the public may not yet view. We miss under Capt. Robert Fitzroy a citation of Darwin's very condensed character of this able officer and scientist (in the Autobiography)—all the more because it furnishes the key to his failure as an administrator in New Zealand. Fitzroy, by the way, was the first who devised storm-signals and put them in practice. Matthew Flinders, another naval captain, was perhaps the first to investigate the error of compasses caused by iron in the ship. Ralph Fitch, a contemporary of Shakspere, was the first Englishman known to have made the overland journey to India by the Euphrates. The first line of the narrative of his voyage in Hakluyt is so closely echoed in "Macbeth" (Act 1, 3) that it is clear Shakspere must have used Hakluyt. Among pioneers we remark, finally, Lieut.-Col. Patrick Ferguson, inventor of the first breechloaders used in the British army. He tried them with effect on the American rebels at Brandywine, but Sir William Howe broke up his rifle corps, and made them exchange their arms for the old muzzle-loaders.

—The French have always been a home-keeping race, partly from their national or parochial belief that France is the true celestial empire, of which Paris is the New Jerusalem, and partly also, perhaps, from a dislike of the sea or of water. A census of Frenchmen living abroad was taken in 1861, and the number reported was only 316,000. This number was almost certainly less than the true one, for the census was roughly and imperfectly taken. In consequence, French consuls all over the world were instructed to report again upon the subject, and the result of their inquiries and their estimates has just been published. This shows that of Frenchmen abroad there were in 1886: in Europe, 200,000; Africa, 30,000; Asia, 15,000; North America, 120,000; South America, 40,000; Oceania, 3,000—in all 408,000. Of those in Europe 54,000 are in Switzerland, 51,000 in Belgium, 26,000 in England, 17,000 in Spain, and 10,000 in Italy. Scarcely any of these emigrants came from central France. Flanders, the Pyrenees, and the Midi furnish most of them. A large number belong to the priesthood, or to the religious orders of men and women.

LODGE'S WASHINGTON.—I.

George Washington. By Henry Cabot Lodge. [American Statesmen Series.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889. 2 vols.

THE serious fact surviving our centennial celebrations is that, though the plaudits were for the traditional Washington, it is with a new Washington that historians must now deal. Research has transformed the most conventionalized of figures into a singularly fresh subject of study, interest in which increases with the perception that, in recovering "the real Washington," the nation is exhuming and deciphering lost or neglected facts and factors of its own history. The valuable work of Dr. Hale; the new data published in the centennial numbers of the magazines and journals; above all, the surprises contained in Mr. Worthington Ford's first two volumes of Washington's writings, have confirmed a growing conviction that, notwithstanding the library of works concerning him, a critical Life of Washington is the desideratum of American history. It would have been unreasonable to expect in Mr. Lodge's work a satisfaction of this need. The subject is too new, too large, the data too incomplete—perhaps, we should add, the popular sentiment too tenacious of traditions—for the appearance of such full and critical treatment in any near future. The most that could be fairly expected from a writer of even Mr. Lodge's ability and opportunities was a large contribution in the direction pointed by historical studies; and by this utilitarian standard his success is to be measured.

It is unfortunate for Mr. Lodge's reputation with students of the period that his task was not limited to Washington's military and political career. Or, if he could have devised a novel method by which history should begin with the later and end with the earlier events,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the task of criticising him would be less embarrassing. We must adopt that method so far as to enter a caveat against any assumption that the whole book is to be judged by its treatment of Washington's early life and the persons and places related thereto. In old Virginia Mr. Lodge is helplessly out of his habitat. What knowledge of the Northern Neck he could obtain by running old Parson Weems to earth, and returning in triumph with his brush, is nearly all that can be conceded our author. He appears ready to accept almost any story—provided it is not in Weems—or any statement found in a book, without attempting verification. The errors in this part of the work are small, so far as the character of Washington is concerned, but they are grave by reason of the mistrust raised that our new guide is ready to leave us now and then in the hands of other guides, whose superannuation or incompetency are the *raison d'être* of his enterprise.

When he writes historic names wrong—Ashley's for Ashby's (Gap), Carey for Cary, Grimes for Grymes—one would gladly conclude that he is some proof-reader's victim; but it is too plain that he is following Washington Irving's mistakes. He repeatedly falls into the Custis and Lossing ruts. Concerning the Westmoreland birthplace we are told, "Three years after George Washington's birth it was burned, and the family removed to another estate in Stafford County" (I, pp. 37, 38). The estate referred to, now in Stafford, was in King George County; the fire is a tradition unknown to Dr. McGuire (in 1836), who says "the change of residence was probably induced by considerations of health" ('Religious Opinions and Character of Washington,' Introduction, p. xv). The same writer, who married Washington's grandniece, dates the removal to the farm near Fredericksburg "about the year 1739." We are further told by Mr. Lodge that "the 'Lowland Beauty,' Mary Bland, married Henry Lee, and became the mother of 'Legion Harry,' a favorite officer and friend of Washington, and the grandmother of Robert E. Lee, the great soldier of the Southern Confederacy" (I, p. 93). The wife and grandmother referred to was Lucy Grymes—who, by the way, was not "of Westmoreland," as is stated on the previous page. We are happy in finding that Mr. Lodge's familiarity with the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* saved him from following the traditional pedigree of Washington, which Colonel Chester "broke beyond repair" in that publication (vol. xxi, p. 25); but apparently he learned this too late to alter his pages, which proceed on the assumption that Washington was by birth an aristocrat, and connected with the disproved family. When Mr. Lodge assumes an "identity of arms" between the immigrants and the Sulgrave family (I, p. 31) we again find ourselves delivered to the modern traditionalist. So far as is known, Washington himself was the first to adopt those arms.

Poor Parson Weems is poetically avenged by the facility with which Mr. Lodge is misled by later Weemses. The "Rules of Civility," written in Washington's youngest handwriting, which have long puzzled historians, are approached by Mr. Lodge with a rhetorical "Eureka":

"It has always been supposed that these rules were copied, but it was reserved apparently for the storms of a mighty civil war to lay bare the original source. At that time a little volume was found in Virginia bearing the name of George Washington in a boyish hand on the flyleaf. The book was entitled 'The Young Man's Companion.' It was an English work . . . by W. Mather, . . . and at the end it contained the rules for behavior found in manuscript among Washington's papers" (I, pp. 49, 50).

"An account of this volume," it is added in a footnote, "was given in the New York *Tribune* in 1866, and also in the *Historical Magazine* (X, 47). It is stated that the book was presented to Gen. Grant, and, if so, it has now passed into the keeping of the Government."

These apparently separate authorities are one, the magazine having copied from the newspaper. The "account" is vague enough, and the point interesting enough, to merit some inquiry. Had this latest biographer of Washington considered that even the New York *Tribune* may occasionally be fallible—had he given due weight to Dr. Toner's edition of the "Rules," in which that well-informed editor states, twenty-two years after the *Tribune*'s "account," that he has searched in vain to find these rules in print—he would at least have examined Mather's well-known book and saved himself the mortification, and his readers the disappointment, of discovering that it contains nothing of the kind.

We should be glad to add, were it possible, that the inattentiveness to details and inexactness, of which we have given some examples, are confined to matters of local and antiquarian interest. But the many brilliant qualities of this book, its certainty of popularity, render it the more necessary to warn its readers that, even when in our author's own hands instead of those of his misleaders, and in grave matters, they must not feel perfectly secure. This spirited, fluent, always interesting book is at the same time subtly theoretical. In most instances Mr. Lodge gives us the facts on which he generalizes, but we note one instance in which the substitution of a version for a quotation is unfortunate. In early life, Washington, writing to his brother concerning his first skirmish, says: "I heard the bullets whistle, and, believe me, there is something charming in the sound." Mr. Lodge says Washington wrote "that he loved to hear the bullets whistle" (I, p. 75). The connotations of the sentences are different. Washington's words may have meant only to reassure his brother as to his courage under fire, or no more than the melodious note made by a bullet; but the airy phrase substituted compels the letter to support Mr. Lodge's theory that "Washington had the fierce, fighting temper of the Northmen. He loved battle and danger, and he never ceased to love them and to give way to their excitement," etc. This is said of a man who wrote: "I am led to reflect how much more delightful to an undebauched mind is the task of making improvements on earth, than all the vain glory which can be acquired from ravaging it by the most uninterrupted career of conquests." In the same vein Mr. Lodge writes, "In this Second Congress he appeared habitually on the floor in his blue-and-buff uniform of a Virginia colonel. It was his way of saying that the hour for action had come," etc. If our author has grounds for believing that Washington wore a dress different from what he had been accustomed to wear as a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses (which John Adams, in mentioning the dress, does not suggest), those grounds should surely have been given. Readers not enamoured of the "fierce fighting temper" may draw from such an individual dress-parade conclusions unfavorable to the modesty and moderation generally supposed to be characteristic of Washington.

Erroneous as Mr. Lodge's theory of Washington's temper appears to us, we probably owe to it the admirable summary of Washington's career in the Revolution to which two-thirds of his first volume are devoted. We would almost advise a reader to begin the first volume on page 131, where the incomprehensible Virginian disappears and the American General comes into view. The very style becomes more free, and at times is even felicitous; the marshalling of facts is skilful, and interest distributed in fair proportion between the military and political aspects of the Revolution. The relation between these aspects, and the governmental evolution which proceeded *pari passu* with the Revolution, are lucidly set forth, and the field of constitutional study somewhat extended.

Mr. Lodge's brain is a fine loom: give it the threads, it will weave them bravely and substantially; but, for selecting or proving the threads, no adequate apparatus is provided him. The wrong thread, or the rotten, is thus sometimes visible in the woof. Mr. Lodge tells the significant story of the General's refusing to open Lord Howe's letter addressed to "George Washington Esq., etc., etc.," as follows: "The bearer was courteously received, but the letter was declined. 'The etc., etc., may mean anything,' said the Englishman. 'It may also mean nothing,' Washington replied." What the messenger said was, "The etc., etc., implies everything." "And anything," said Washington.

A more serious fault appears in Mr. Lodge's scroll where he undertakes to relate the Asgill affair. Capt. Huddy having been hanged by a party of Tories, headed by the British Capt. Lippencott (not Lippincott, as Mr. Lodge spells the name), Washington and his generals determined on retaliation. From among his prisoners Washington caused one to be selected by lot to suffer death unless Lippencott should be delivered up.

"The fatal lot," says Mr. Lodge, "had fallen upon a mere boy, Capt. Asgill, who was both amiable and popular, and Washington was beset with appeals in his behalf, for Lady Asgill moved heaven and earth to save her son. She interested the French court, and Vergennes made a special request that Asgill should be released. Even Washington's own officers, notably Hamilton, sought to influence him, and begged him to recede. In these difficult circumstances he hesitated, and asked instructions from Congress. . . . It was difficult to refuse Vergennes, and Congress, glad of the excuse and anxious to oblige their allies, ordered the release of Asgill."

Mr. Lodge speaks of this as a "petty" incident, and such it is in his page; but the pivot of the whole affair is omitted. Asgill had been among the officers surrendered with Cornwallis under terms which excluded him from liability to be used as a hostage in any subsequent reprisals. This fact has, indeed, been omitted by Washington's biographers, and we must suppose that the papers relating to it have escaped their attention. We have before us the copy of a correspondence now in possession of a descendant of Gen. Lincoln which shows the incident to have been by no means petty in the eyes of Washington. The officer with the British prisoners, Maj. Gordon, under date of May 27, 1782, writes to Washington, calling his attention to the Fourteenth Article of the Cornwallis capitulation, which "expressly says that no articles of capitulation are to be infringed on pretext of reprisals," etc. Washington, in a letter marked "Private," writes to the Secretary of War (Lincoln) as follows:

"5th June, 1782.

"My Dear Sir,—Col. Hazen's sending me an officer under the capitulation of Yorktown for the purpose of retaliation has distressed me exceedingly. Be so good as to give me your opinion of the propriety of doing this upon Captain Asgill, if we should be driven to it for want of an unconditional prisoner. Presuming

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that this matter has been a subject of much conversation, pray with your own let me know the opinions of the most sensible of those with whom you have conversed. Congress by their resolve has unanimously approved of my determination to retaliate. The army have advised it, and the country look for it. But how far is it justifiable upon an officer under the faith of a capitulation, if none other can be had, is the question? Hazen's sending Capt'n Asgill on for this purpose makes the matter more distressing, as the whole business will have the appearance of a farce, if some person is not sacrafced to the mains [*sic*] of poor Huddy; which will be the case if an unconditional prisoner cannot be found, and Asgill escapes. I write you in exceeding great haste; but beg your sentiments may be transmitted as soon as possible (by express), as I may be forced to a decision in the course of a few days.—I am most sincerely and affectionately, D'r Sir, yr obed't, G. WASHINGTON."

Birds through an Opera-Glass. By Florence A. Merriam. [No. 3. The Riverside Library for Young People.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1889.

IT is undoubtedly true that in this country anything approaching an accurate knowledge of birds and their ways is confined to the few, and these chiefly professional naturalists and writers. Even the farmers, whose lives are spent among birds, and whose interests are much concerned with their habits, know little about them. When asked by inquiring city cousins to name their feathered friends, the list is a short one, and usually comprises only the most common, as the robin, bluebird, meadow-lark, high-hole, chewink, barn-swallow, and "chippy," by which latter term they usually know, or rather fail to know, all the brown-colored sparrows. The chicken-hawk closes the list, and under that name the farmer's boy is taught to exterminate ruthlessly all the birds of prey, regardless of the fact that nearly all of them perform useful service to agriculture, while but one or two are destructive to poultry.

It is difficult to say how far this general ignorance of the most beautiful and useful part of animated creation is to be attributed to the rather unattractive form which ornithological treatises are wont to assume, to their technical descriptions and repellent names. It is certain that writers like John Burroughs, Bradford Torrey, and others address a larger circle of readers than do professional ornithologists, and that they, and not the professional ornithologists, are the successful educators of the masses. A new writer now steps to the front and gives us the little book called 'Birds through an Opera-Glass.' Its title sufficiently reveals its purpose, which is to invite laymen, and laywomen as well, to the woods and pastures, where, glass in hand, they are to seek an introduction to the birds, study their habits, and by so doing gain at once a knowledge of bird life which books cannot supply, and reap the sure rewards which Nature always confers on her votaries.

The plan of the book is happily conceived. It is intended to be suggestive, as the preface frankly tells us, nothing more. Evidently the writer thinks that they who require to be told all they want to know of Nature and her doings are not worth troubling herself about. The circle she addresses includes those who are willing to take a little pains to acquire the information they desire, and able to find pleasure in the task. She takes her readers into her confidence, invites them to a stroll in the woods, glass and notebook in hand, and presses her eyes and methods into their service. The object of the excursion is to discover just how the birds appear as they busy themselves about their daily avocations, and what they say in response to kindly questionings. For her the dried skin, the table of measurements, and the technical description have no existence, as, indeed, why should they? All know the robin, and, by taking it as the unit of measure, other birds are easily subjected to a comparative diagnosis, while the colors and habits of each species are pleasantly described and made to reveal its identity.

The author has a happy knack of seizing upon the salient peculiarities most likely to strike the average untrained observer. Now the locality is pointed out where such and such birds are most likely to be met with; now it is the method of capturing its prey, a characteristic attitude or a peculiar jerking of the tail, or what not, that is depended upon to lead the inquirer in the right direction. As she herself says: "It was my good fortune when in college to be able to study the perplexities of nearly forty young observers, and this book is virtually the result of what I learned of their wants and the best way to supply them." Besides the acquaintance with the needs of her audience, gained in the way described, the author brings to her task far more important qualifications. She has good eyes, and especially a stock of patience which, when associated and added to a true love of nature, never fails to make a good observer.

The bits of philosophy she weaves into her stories, and the likeness to human actions and human nature which she discerns in her bird friends, are very pleasantly told. The poets are frequently taxed to contribute their share to the bird stories, and the quotations are apt and well selected. The space devoted to the several species is, as a rule, when the intent of the book is considered, judiciously apportioned, though such birds as the cuckoo, meadow-lark, whippoorwill, and some others are perhaps dismissed with scantier mention than their interest and merits deserve. In addition to the descriptive matter in the text under each species, the author has added an appendix which the tyro will find of decided advantage. The family characteristics of the birds treated are given in untechnical language, and the birds are then classified according to the localities they most frequent, their size as compared with the robin, their colors, their songs, shape of bill, nesting habits, etc.

Altogether, we have in 'Birds through an Opera-Glass' a book wisely planned, well written, and sure to please its readers, even if it should not accomplish all its author intended in taking them out of doors as observers and as readers of the book of nature wherein the author has found her own inspiration. It is to be hoped that the reception given to the present volume will accord with its merits, and so encourage the production of others like it.

Memorial of Sarah Pugh: A Tribute of Respect from her Cousins. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.

THIS little volume is in the nature of an autobiography, being mainly composed of extracts from Miss Pugh's diaries and letters. It should have had a portrait of her in default of any clear intimation of her personal appearance, which had all the charm of the best type of Quakeress, joined to a breadth and liberality and strength of mind not always discernible in the physiognomy of Friends; a dignity of carriage that caused her diminutive figure to be forgotten; and an immaculate gentility of attire. Miss Pugh was born on the slave-cursed soil of Virginia in 1800, but was taken to Pennsylvania before she was old enough to retain any impressions of her surroundings, and found her life-work and ended her days in Philadelphia. She had outgrown the trammels of her sect when George Thompson came to this country on his first anti-slavery mission in 1834, and his eloquence drew her at once into the ranks of the working abolitionists. In 1840 she was one of the local delegates to the London World's Anti-Slavery Convention, and shared the fate of all her colleagues of her own sex in being excluded from membership in that body, which was under the control of Orthodox Friends of a very bigoted stripe. She made a protracted European tour in 1851-'53, being in Paris during the Coup d'État, though she appears to have seen nothing of the street conflict, or any disorder approaching that of which she had been a witness in her own city at the burning of Pennsylvania Hall in 1838, or the Rynders mob in this city in 1850.

These are the salient features of Miss Pugh's experience as revealed in the Memorial, which might have been made much more valuable if the editor had been conversant with the history of the anti-slavery struggle. The 'Life of Garrison' alone, so far as published, would have guided him in his selections from the diaries, and enabled him to elucidate passages now left obscure. The account, on p. 18, of the causes of the schism among the abolitionists in 1836-1840 is anachronistic and wholly inadequate. On p. 19 "the [Clerical] Appeal" of 1837 is referred to by Miss Pugh, and needs explanation. And we ought to have had the allusion, on p. 39, to Miss Bremer's deviation from anti-slavery fidelity cleared up. On p. 31, C. *K.* Whipple is misprinted C. *H.* On the whole, we are left with the feeling that the diaries contain a great deal more that deserved to see the light than the Quaker cousins have detected.

A few personal glimpses are noteworthy, as of Lord John Russell and George Cruikshank speaking together at a Mechanics' Institute (p. 68), the caricaturist not failing to bear his temperance testimony. Miss Pugh also attended an anti-slavery reception by the Duchess of Sutherland at Stafford House (p. 73); and in London—

"I met by appointment a Miss Evans, translator of Strauss, at present assistant editor of the *Westminster Review*, and tried to interest her in our anti-slavery movement, as she is a clear thinker, and may have much in her power. . . . The evening was spent at Mrs. [Eliza Lee] Follen's. George Thompson, Mr. [Victor] Schoelcher, Miss Evans, and Miss Murray. There was some anti-slavery talk, but the evening was principally occupied with the rappings" (p. 53).

Miss Pugh afterwards visited Miss Martineau, but of this meeting we are given no details. Of Miss Martineau's most intimate friend and biographer Miss Pugh cites this characteristic bon-mot: "M. W. Chapman used to say in anti-slavery days, 'Of course we want all the virtues on board, but Prudence is the one we can best spare'" (p. 128). The subject of this memoir lived to the ripe old age of eighty-four. At fifty-two she was conversing with a venerable English lady regarding the talk about the poor showing made by the Americans at the World's Fair of 1851. By way of apology—

"I said, 'You must remember that America is young—that I, a woman now living, remember when we used to ask for *the return of a pin* that had been borrowed, and one of our school mottoes was,

'To see a pin and let it lie,
You'll come to want before you die.'"

Zwei Jahrzehnte deutscher Politik, und die gegenwärtige Weltlage. Von Eduard von Hartmann. Leipzig: Wilhelm Friedrich.

FEW writers could venture to reprint newspaper and magazine articles, fifteen or twenty years old, more particularly when the articles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in question treat of politics and are written in German. The author of the 'Philosophy of the Unconscious' is perhaps the only living German writer whose style possesses enough intrinsic attraction to make almost any subject readable. The essays he has collected in this volume originally appeared in the *Gegenwart*, *Grenzboten*, *Im Neuen Reich*, and other periodicals. Next to the wonderful flexibility and grace of its language, the most striking feature of the book is found in the remarkable perversions of logic and morals imposed upon one who endeavors, on high philosophic grounds, to justify the ways of Bismarck to Germany, and to defend his protectionist and socialistic vagaries. Even when not concerned as a champion of the German Chancellor, Hartmann seems impelled, by innate "cussedness," to proclaim doctrines that run directly counter to the generally received principles of justice and honor. Thus, he sets up as an historic law, that written treaties are valid only as long as the circumstances under which they were made have not changed—in other words, that no nation is bound to abide by its own solemn obligations except when it cannot help itself. As an actual fact, it is no doubt true that the path of history is strewn with the fragments of broken treaties; but nations and statesmen, however ruthlessly they have trampled upon their troth, have always sedulously cultivated at least the appearance of good faith, and have endeavored, by special pleading, to show in each instance that it was not they, but the other party, that broke the engagement. It was reserved for a German ideologue of the nineteenth century to formulate the convenient doctrine that "the logic of historical development forces the rising party to a formal breaking of the written law, in order to afford validity to the higher law of the actual historical facts."

But the author goes to the most surprising lengths in his chapters on protection and free trade. He sets out with the apparently candid admission that "no protectionist of any intellectual significance will deny that free trade is an ideal whose realization must be aimed at, as soon as the conditions of its possibility are given; that all protectionist theories claim only provisional validity. The ideal condition of commerce is, of course, that in which every country exchanges the products in which it has an advantage for the peculiar products of other countries without hindrance." This frank avowal promises well and has a familiar sound; but to American protectionists, who have now abandoned the ground they used to take, it will seem a weak concession to the enemy. Hartmann, however, goes on to say that all commerce depends on reciprocity, that each country must not only receive, but also give, and that this condition can only be satisfied permanently when both countries stand on an approximately equal level of economic development.

"Even when an industrial state," he says, "exchanges its manufactures for the cereals of an agricultural state, this relation can only end in exhausting the soil of the latter and impoverishing it, unless it employs the money received for its products, at least in part, in establishing manufactures of its own before its soil is utterly drained."

This peculiar sentence has the true protectionist ring, and nobody but a throroughbred protectionist could evolve it. One is at a loss whether most to admire the idea that a farmer who has sold his grain to a foreign country is to invest the proceeds in building cotton and woollen mills, or the other equally original idea that the agricultural country will go on selling its grain until its soil is exhausted and the people are starving. Further on we also meet that old friend of ours, the theory that the doctrine of free trade is only a cunning device of England for draining other countries of their wealth. We are informed that, in contradistinction to this false kind of free trade, there is a genuine kind, based on reciprocity, and to be established by a gradual extension of the German Zollverein, which shall ultimately embrace all the European states except England; but what the untrained intellect of a free-trader cannot understand is, how or why there should be any commerce at all between nations all of which have reached the same level of economic development, and all of which are consequently capable of producing all the commodities which their citizens require. Such is the heaven that protectionists dream of, and its most perfect realization will have been attained when every village is entirely self-sufficing and independent of every other.

"All other civilized states," says our author, "surround themselves with protective tariffs out of aversion to free trade, but Germany does it out of love for free trade, and for the purpose of promoting it; just as France, Russia, and Italy maintain great armies from an inclination for war and from a lust for the gains to be hoped from offensive wars, while Germany maintains its immense army from a love of peace, and to hold in check the warlike desires of its neighbors."

Although this sounds like one of Artemus Ward's pleasantries, it is intended quite seriously, and there is much other equally edifying matter in this book. The only work in the English language that can match it for consistent wrongheadedness and perverted ingenuity is Henry C. Carey's 'Letters on International Copyright,' first published in 1852, and of which a second edition appeared in 1868. Whether a mental affinity between these two able writers has landed them both in the protectionist camp, or whether their devotion to the doctrine of protection has in both cases produced the same mental warp, may be open to discussion; probably the latter supposition is the correct one, for it is more than likely that if Bismarck's necessities had impelled him in the direction of free trade, Hartmann would have displayed his brilliant dialectics on that side of the controversy. It is difficult to be greatly moved by the eloquence of a lawyer who would have been equally eloquent on the other side if the other side had retained him.

Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen des Klassischen Altertums. Von Imhoof-Blumer und Otto Keller. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1889.

Two years ago we spoke of Prof. Keller's book entitled 'Thiere des Classischen Alterthums.' This was a work in a field not often traversed, and its purpose was to point out the parts played by animals in all the various scenes of ancient civilization. Under the bear, for instance, were discussed the localities in Europe, Asia, and Egypt in which he was found, his position in mythology and religion, how he was hunted, baited in the amphitheatre, or tamed, and how his skin, fat, and meat were used. There were also collected the speculations of the ancient writers on his nature, together with the names of different species, representations of them in art, and, finally, remarks on his apotheosis, as it were, into a constellation. About thirty animals and birds were treated in this fashion, and the whole was conceived in the scholarly style familiar to those acquainted with the author's work in the domain of Horatian criticism.

In the course of this book Prof. Keller remarked that the place of animals in the civilization of antiquity would probably be best understood and illustrated after a study of contemporary coins and gems. The new work before us bears out fully the truth of that observation, and is an indispensable supplement to its predecessor. A series of twenty-six plates, containing phototypes of over thirteen hundred coins and gems, certainly affords an unique opportunity for the study of this particular branch of philology. In the place of the thirty animals and birds above mentioned, we have noted here nearly three hundred, including mammals, birds, amphibia, reptiles, fishes, insects, and crustacea, together with many of those products of the Greek fancy—creatures that never were on sea or land. To these must be added a large collection of plants and trees, interesting from the point of view of agriculture, religion, or in other connections.

The plates are preceded by a full description of every coin and gem, together with an excellent quintuple index. The intention is to present not a complete illustrated catalogue of all the varying types of the different plants and animals, but merely the best and most interesting examples of each. The more important variations from the normal type are briefly mentioned, however, and, in the case of the rarest, all the examples known to the authors are either pictured or mentioned.

The selection and description of the coins has fallen to the share of Prof. Imhoof-Blumer, whose work in Greek numismatics is well known. Nearly all the coins chosen are of the period of Greek independence; those of a later date, as well as Roman coinage, are used only when the earlier sources were deficient. The gems, arranged by Prof. Keller, are not mere repetitions of those found in our common handbooks. Most of them have not hitherto been published in a trustworthy form, and not a few are real *inedita*. They are gathered from all the principal collections of Europe. Both gems and coins are reproduced in natural size, except those on one plate, which, for a special reason, have been one-and-a-half times enlarged. The phototypes are finely executed, and in only a few instances have we been obliged to use a magnifying glass.

Given a collection of animals varying in size from the elephant to the parasitic crab found on the thunny fish, the scholar will be difficult indeed who does not find something to excite his interest and attention, while the reviewer may well be at a loss what to select for particular commendation. Even Mr. Sandys might find here additional material for his already richly illustrated edition of the 'Bacchæ.' The coins and gems offer many Dionysiac scenes, one of the most beautiful being a large coin of Ephesus, bearing on the obverse a snake issuing from the half-open *cista mystica*, the whole enclosed in an ivy wreath. A rhinoceros driven by a man with a goad, on a Berlin gem, might have been the one exhibited by Augustus in the Septa. A dekadrachmon of Syracuse presents what might be called a lovely picture of the little ivory chariot and horses with which Nero used to amuse himself, while even Domitian's fly finds its appropriate representation. When we are so generously treated, it is perhaps invidious to speak of omissions; but among the pictures of the Sphinx we miss the scene of her killing by Œdipus. This is represented in Lippert (Dact. 1, 2, 79), and we have seen it also on a carnelian scarab, one of a collection belonging to Mr. J. R. Lowell. In the same collection is another, interesting for its antiquity, as shown by the marks of the drill, and for the reason that it probably represents Heracles returning from the Erymanthian hunt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He leans on a staff, and staggers under the burden of the boar, slung over his shoulder. We have not seen this published, either in the present work or elsewhere.

By the way, this book is dedicated—rather an unusual thing in a German book—to two Americans, Dr. George M. Lane of Cambridge and Mr. Stephen Salisbury of Worcester. We learn from the preface that Prof. Keller has received a call to the new Clark University.

Eli and Sibyl Jones: Their Life and Work. By Rufus M. Jones. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates.

ELI JONES is still living, or was when this book was written. Sibyl, his wife, died in 1873. Together they presented an aspect somewhat unusual in our time. They were missionary Friends. They felt themselves "called by the spirit" to go hither and thither and proclaim what to them were tidings of great joy. Except for this reliance on the spirit, which was as simple and sincere as it was with George Fox or any of the early Friends, their modes of thought and speech and life are more suggestive of Methodism or some other form of sentimental evangelical piety than of Quakerism. While looking to the spirit for direction as to the missionary journeys they should make, and while holding very distinctly to the original doctrine of the spirit as a supernatural voice, their dependence on the written Word and the personal Jesus was quite other than that of the early Friends, and perfectly in keeping with the average orthodoxy of the present time.

Eli Jones was the first of eleven children born to his parents in the course of twenty-one years. Children were then regarded as a blessing from the Lord, and the blessing was frequently invoked. The boy's earliest and life-long home was in China, Maine, a recent settlement at the time of his birth in 1807. Sibyl, a Jones before marriage, was presumably a relative of her husband; in what degree we are not told. Eli claimed descent from the Jones who steered the *Mayflower;* on his mother's side from Robinson of Leyden. Eli and Sibyl were married in 1833. Their first missionary excursion was to Canada in 1840. This was followed by others to the South and West. In 1851 it was "laid upon them" that they should go to Liberia. There is a suggestion here, and there are others elsewhere, that, while anti-slavery, as all Friends were supposed to be, as such, they were more in sympathy with the Colonizationists than with the Abolitionists. We find Eli at a Colonization meeting and consorting with Colonization leaders, but never in any Abolition meeting. In general, the religion of this worthy couple was of the other-worldly kind, though the interests of temperance and peace were dear to them. All of their missionary effort was singularly touch-and-go. Their sense of moral exigency was satisfied by making in one place an address, generally brief, setting forth the most familiar doctrines of a conventional orthodoxy, and then passing to another place to do the same.

After all their trouble in getting to Liberia in a sailing vessel, with rough passengers and a rougher crew, they remained only a few weeks, and the advantages claimed for their activity by their biographer are not easily made out. After their return, they soon set out again, and went to England, Ireland, Norway, Switzerland, and Southern France. An account, by Elihu Burritt, of their speaking in London gives us almost our only impression of their peculiar power. Eli's voice is set down as dreadfully nasal, even for an American. Sibyl's was low and sweet and clear, and it is evident that her lips were touched with persuasion. John Bright was much delighted with her speaking. It is a very serious defect of this biography that we nowhere have the substance of their message. With almost algebraic conciseness, we are told of their speaking here and there, and of the deep impression they made, but what they said is hidden from us, probably because of its extemporaneous character. It would appear that they spoke English only, and had recourse to an interpreter everywhere upon the European continent and in Syria, whither they went in 1867 and again in 1869. This must have been a serious limitation. Twice after his wife's death Eli Jones returned to Syria, where something more was done in the way of organized work than elsewhere. The unearthing of a Quaker community in Southern France was the most interesting episode of the travels of the two in that region.

The only speech we have of Eli Jones's was not delivered *in partibus infidelium*, unless the Maine Legislature comes under that designation. He was elected to the Legislature, and it was thought a good joke by his fellow-legislators to elect him, a Quaker and peace man, Major-General of Militia. But he was entirely equal to the situation, and told them frankly how he should proceed in case he took command. It was probably another joke that made him, an ardent temperance man and total abstainer, salesman of liquors in his native town. For the year of his service the Maine Law was strictly enforced.

Eli and Sibyl Jones had many noble friends. Whittier sang them away to Palestine, and in his poem, "The Meeting," Sibyl is easily descried. The ungodly may suggest that a passion for extensive travel may have had something to do with their missionary zeal, but a very simple and sufficient answer is at hand: Sibyl Jones was so much of an invalid that travel was to her generally a painful exercise. The wisdom of their methods may be subject to some doubt; but to read their biography is to be certain of the simplicity and goodness of their hearts.

On Parliamentary Government in England, its Origin, Development, and Practical Operation. By Alpheus Todd, LL.D., C.M.G., Librarian of the Canadian Parliament, etc. Second edition by his son. Longmans, Green & Co. 2 vols. 8vo.

AN exhaustive manual of the methods of practical government in England must be an invaluable help to the British officer in every department of the civil service. But its use is not limited to Great Britain. Statesmen in every nation in the globe will have constant use for a book of reference which has systematized for them the English governmental organization in all its machinery with a completeness not before approached. Everybody has at times occasion to seek the explanation of administrative methods; or the law of official responsibility, the history of the Cabinet, or the relation of its members to each other, to the Prime Minister, to the Queen, to Parliament. On every such topic Mr. Todd's book is an authority, with its precedents well digested and its contents so well arranged and indexed as to make it an excellent manual for ready reference. For all who are interested in administrative politics, either for the sake of comprehending in detail the complex machinery of England's Government or for the study of civil-service questions as a matter of comparative politics, the book is unique in its completeness even to minutest details. The author is one of those benefactors to the busy or the studious man who bestow unbounded and ungrudging labor and no little historical and literary ability upon reference-books which the world cannot afford to be without, but for which the author finds little recompense except in the consciousness of having well performed a most difficult and valuable task.

Taken in connection with Mr. Todd's other work, 'Parliamentary Government in the Colonies,' these volumes give us the complete organization and business working of the British Empire, in a way which leaves little to desire.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Allen, Grant. The Tents of Shem. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Argyll, Duke of. What is Truth? A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 25 cents.
Griswold, W. M. Annual Index to Periodicals for 1888. Bangor; W. M. Griswold.
Haggard, H. R. Cleopatra. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.
Hargreaves, J. G. Literary Workers; or, Pilgrims to the Temple of Honor. Longmans, Green & Co. $2.50.
Hooper, G. Wellington. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
Irving, Henry, and Marshall, F. A. Shakspere's Works. Vol. 6. Othello, Antony, Coriolanus, King Lear. Scribner & Welford. $3.
Lathrop, G. P. Two Sides of a Story. Cassell & Co. 50 cents.
Littell's Living Age. April—June, 1889. Vol. clxxxi. Boston: Littell & Co.
Mathews, Fannie A. To-night at Eight. Belford, Clarke & Co. 50 cents.
McCarroll, J. Madeline, and Other Poems. Belford, Clarke & Co.
McCarthy, Mrs. E. W. Assemblyman John; or, His Wife's Ambition. Belford, Clarke & Co. 25 cents.
Meadowcroft, W. H. The A B C of Electricity. Frank F. Lovell & Co. 50 cents.
Pennell, J. & E. Our Journey to the Hebrides. Harper & Bros.
Pierson, E. De L. The Merry Muse: Society Verse by American Writers. New ed. Belford, Clarke & Co.
Taft, J. S. The Terror of Greenholm. New York.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places..$2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make cable transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies, also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelling credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers.

NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

Bishop, Gorham & Van Kleeck

EDWARD F. BISHOP, AUSTIN G. GORHAM, HENRY VAN KLEECK. } *DENVER, COLO.*

INVESTMENTS AND LOANS.

Money loaned, interest collected, investments made and taken care of for Eastern investors in Colorado and the West.

References: Robert M. Morse, Jr., and Edward C. Perkins, Boston; James M. McLean, Pres. Man. Life Ins. Co. Amos Cotting, New York, and the banks of Denver.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

254 Fifth Avenue, between 28th and 29th Sts., New York.

Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

Johns Hopkins University,

BALTIMORE.

Announcements for the next academic year are now ready and will be sent on application.

NEW CATALOGUE of Books in good condition now ready. Books purchased. E. W. JOHNSON, 1336 Broadway.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLS. AND SETS of the *Nation* bought, sold, and exchanged. A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED